

# Public Comments

## Archery Deer Baiting Timeframe

---

**Tom Braun**

**Hot Springs SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

GF&P has stated that baiting and feeding deer aids the spread of CWD. Therefore, BAN BAITING! How you can come up w/all the restrictions regarding CWD (which are good and understandable) yet allow baiting, and EXPAND IT BY OPENING THE "BAITING SEASON" 2 WEEKS EARLIER IS IDIOTIC! Also, many of us believe baiting to be unethical, and does more to damage the image of hunters in the eyes of the public.

## Chronic Wasting Disease

---

**Mark Peterson**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

This proposal is extreme overkill and puts far too much on the hunter when there is almost zero evidence that hunter movement of carcasses has any relevance to movement/transmission of CWD. I would propose keeping the disposal requirements but not keeping the specific requirements on breaking down and removing the spinal column etc on animals in the CWD control area.

This is a vast over-reach when you look at the numbers on animals tested and positive tests.

Transmission and spreading are far more linked to overpopulation and hyperconcentration of animals.

---

**Mark Olsen**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

The CWD rule on meat transport seems like a rule just to make a rule. I am by no means any kind of expert on how CWD is passed from one animal to the next. But the chances of CWD passing from the remains of one animal a hunter is transporting to a live animal seems so far remote that there are better chances getting struck by lightning. I mean is this a problem where a live animal is coming into contact with an animal that has been hunt harvested then on top of that the harvested animal would have to have CWD?

---

**Jacob Pries**

**Bogart GA**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

On behalf of the Quality Deer Management Association (QDMA), we would like to state our strong support for the regulations promulgated by the South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Commission on Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD) and respectfully request these vital regulations be enacted. The QDMA is a national nonprofit wildlife conservation organization dedicated to ensuring the future of white-tailed deer, wildlife habitat and our hunting heritage. Founded in 1988, the QDMA has over 60,000 members nationwide and our membership includes hunters, landowners and natural resource professionals.

CWD is nothing short of an epidemic within the wildlife community and these common-sense regulations address the expanding problem of CWD in the United States keeping South Dakota's successful hunting industry thriving. CWD is an always fatal disease found in all native North American cervids including elk, moose, mule and white-tailed deer, and it has now been identified in 26 U.S. states, three Canadian provinces, Korea, Finland and Norway. Contagions spread through urine, feces, saliva, blood, deer parts, and especially via live animals. Importantly, there is no vaccine, no cure and no practical live animal test. Research shows plants uptake prions from infected soil, and hamsters that ate the plants contracted the disease. In addition, recent research provides evidence of some infection in humanized mice. These results do not cast a favorable light for CWD, deer, and American agriculture.

Whitetails are the most popular big game animal in the U.S., and whitetail hunters are the foundation of the nearly \$67 billion hunting industry. According to the National Shooting Sports Foundation, approximately three of every four hunters pursue whitetails. Additionally, 430,000 sportsmen and women in South Dakota contribute over \$1.04 billion annually and support 14,780 jobs. These regulations allow for the preservation of the white-tailed deer hunting culture that runs deep in the hearts of so many South Dakotans, while ensuring the necessary precautions are taken into consideration to preserve the economic contributions of hunters within your state. These necessary regulations are the next crucial step in South Dakota to address the problem of CWD being tackled across the country. On behalf of the Quality Deer Management Association, we would like to thank you for your time, dedicated service to the state of South Dakota, and your consideration of this matter. Please feel free to reach out with any questions.

Respectfully,

Jacob Pries  
Policy Intern  
Quality Deer Management Association

---

**David Hiler**

**Arlington SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

If it were many that had CWD they should be culled out and disposed in the right way let experienced hunters go in as a working group and be organized to lessen the chance to spread.

---

**Scott Brekke**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Now I understand the restricted area is not near me or my hunting land ...so some may say easy for you to support it all....but what I am is a hunter who wants to be able to hunt with his grandson someday...everything I read makes sense. ..bout time really..do what we got to do ...my2cents

---

**Bailey Gullikson**

**Pierre SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I am in support of these restrictions, however, I would add that there should be restrictions on feeding wildlife. Lessening the probability of nose to nose contact would help decrease the risk of spreading the disease.

---

**James Barnett**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Why not do it this fall?

---

**James Barnett**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Why not do it this fall?

---

**Brian Aker**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

The GFP has to be willing to get their butts out to the truck seats and take care of the road kill deer as well. Rotten carcasses on every hiway will certainly spread the disease.

---

**Robert Rohrer**

**Chancellor SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

So I can't transport my trophy to get it mounted at my taxidermist of choice not in favor of this.

---

**Oonagh Wood**

**Pringle SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

Does SDGF&P require mandatory testing for CWD from elk/deer taken from areas known to have CWD? If not, why not?

---

**Kevin Rosse**

**Onida SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

This will obviously be a inconvenience for us hunters but is a necessary step in the right direction! I would suggest setting up drop stations for us to properly dispose of spinal column and heads.

---

**Gary Decker**

**Centerville SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

maybe u should sell more tags for these areas. been applying for ever with no success. Better to at least hunt them instead of letting die of cwd. I dont think your proposals will work. I would say it's very rare for a live deer to come into contact with carcass. seems like more unneccesary useless ,over regulation, with no real benefit for wildlife or hunter.

---

**John Ulumern**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Not allowing animals from other states is not good. If I bring an animal in from WY and dispose of an approved landfill, who cares? Seems there are several reasonable solutions out there without implementing unnecessary laws. Reject this thing!

---

**Brian Green**

**Piedmont SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Not being able to remove a whole carcass from the identified infected area will make it impossible for hunters that don't know how to process their own deer to hunt. How would it be possible to process game carcasses in the field in some of the weather conditions that our state experiences during the hunting seasons for deer? I fully support not wanting to spread CWD, but the proposed rules are going to make something that was once enjoyable, to now be a white knuckle experience with hunters so worried about making sure they follow the CWD rules, or fear citations from GFP. Your agency is essentially crippling the hunting population to exclude people with medical limitations that can't process their own game, and those with no experience on butchering an animal. These rules will directly increase the amount of game left to waste in the field for fear of not being allowed to meet GFP's new restrictions.

---

**Brian Heidbrink**

**Brandin SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I feel the CWD rules should be modified to allow hunters to somehow keep and transport a buck deer / bull elk head out of a CWD area. Many hunters don't want a full shoulder taxidermy mount and especially many elk hunters don't have the space to hang a full elk shoulder mount and so they instead prefer to do a European mount with the head boiled and bleached with the antlers attached. Also, the majority of hunters are not capable or experienced to cape out a head of a trophy buck/bull that would want to get mounted in order to cut the skull cap off. I would suggest a compromise to allow heads to be transported or allowed to be transported with the brains removed.

---

**Todd Craig**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Although this proposal will make it more difficult for some hunters, we are the leaders in wildlife conservation and we must step up and lead again.

---

**Jeremy Krause**

**Canton SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I don't see what the difference would make hauling a dead deer versus a live one that can spread the disease would?

---

**Guy Bennett**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I would like to see that you can transport a whole skull if the brain and spine is removed. There are tools out there to remove the brain from a skull so you could still do a european mount

---

**Dr Bob Woerman**

**Brandon SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

SD GFP has a good start on control of transporting harvested game. But those who harvest are not professional butchers or DVM's. How does the hunter know all brain tissue is removed. Need an inspection. Field dressing, all removed when field dressing needs to be collected & disposed where it will go to a landfill. PREVENT. CWD SPREAD. This is a bit like pork & African Swine Fever. Not only are live pigs prevented from coming to US but also frozen unprocessed meat & processed meat.

---

**Eric Loken**

**Camp Crook SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

As a licensed taxidermist in the State of SD, I have some concerns about the CWD proposal. My biggest concern is proposal 1. Interstate Carcass Transportation, section A & B. 70% of my taxidermy business is from out of state. Most hunters that bring game heads to my taxidermy shop are not able nor do they have the knowledge to cape out and cut and clean the skull plate properly so it can be transported to my shop and where it can be processed and mounted. By not allowing hunters to transport whole cervid carcasses to my shop you are jeopardizing the success of my business and livelihood. I propose adding to the proposal 1. ICT "allowing whole cervid carcasses to be transported to a taxidermist shop for processing and then the taxidermist as defined by 41:09:11:02 shall dispose of all remaining cervid carcass parts taken from another state etc. with a waste management provider or a permitted landfill.

Thanks and if you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

---

**Chris Mayer**

**Edgemont SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

The enactment of this regulation will prevent me from bringing my whole deer carcasses to a Wyoming meat locker 24 miles away (nearest facility). I live within 3 miles of the SD/WY boarder, near the imaginary line that Elk & Deer cross daily without regards to their health. The processor is licensed by the state of Wyoming and some consideration must be made for SD residents transporting whole carcasses (elk or deer) to neighboring state processors. Then next available option for me is Rapid City area processors, a 2-hour trip. That is unrealistic.

---

**Larry Crawford**

**Sturgis SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

What about the many roadkill deer, are they being disposed in a proper manner?

---

**Bud Shearer**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Not acceptable for anyone with the need to transport animals across the state. In fact ridiculous!!

---

**Clark Baker**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

So basically if U do get lucky and draw a black hill deer tag, U can't transport it. Unless you cut it up...U folks can't ruin hunting much more....

---

**Mark Peterson**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I oppose this proposed changed.

Other changes should be considered first before requiring hunters to completely debone animals prior like just requiring disposal in a landfill.

---

**Rod Heinrich**

**Hecla SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I understand the reasoning and the science behind the plan. But- I believe it is one more nail in the coffin. I know people have quit hunting because there's more rules than than they want to deal with, can't get permission to hunt, to many pheasant hunters on public land etc. And now they are going to come home from a hot spot or out of state and have to find a permitted company and pay them to dispose of the there deer parts.

---

**Delwyn Newman**

**Lemmon SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

- 1) To keep big game from congregating in an area baiting should not be allowed and also feeding deer, elk should not be a practice for the general public, the public needs to know they could be aiding in the spread of CWD.
- 2) Private farms for deer or elk should have a double fence around their perimeter to keep wild animals from coming into contact with the private herd. (Wisconsin has this rule for private herds)
- 3) Maybe something could be done to allow a hunter to take the head and spinal cord to an approved site for disposal in an endemic area so as to further the cause of stopping or slowing down the spread of CWD. (rather than leaving in the field). Thank You

---

**Douglas Dexter**

**Milbank SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I DO support the CWD Action Plan, however I support the "Second Draft" version from June 2019. Which appears to be the same as "Alternative #2" choices from the Final version dated July 2019. Maybe the 2 versions are saying the same thing, but the wording appears to be saying differently. As a licensed taxidermist, residing near the MN state border, I have seen first hand the effects of not allowing whole carcass transportation on the taxidermy business. It is detrimental to the taxidermist's income by not allowing carcass transportation, either interstate or intrastate. If we as taxidermists are going to assist in sample collection, we need the required parts of the carcass to do so. If you are going to make it difficult, or prohibitive, for the hunter to dispose of the carcass responsibly, they will continue to discard the carcasses anywhere in the rural areas of our state. Thank you.

---

**Paul Pierson**

**Belle Fourche SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Gregory Palmer**

**Nemo SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.



---

**Jeff Delay**

**Madison SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

It sounds too restrictive and unmanageable.  
We've always processed our own game and dispose of the waste to a certified landfill.

---

**Jeff Delay**

**Madison SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

It sounds too restrictive and unmanageable.  
We've always processed our own game and dispose of the waste to a certified landfill.

---

**Jason Taylor**

**Fort Pierre SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I am fine with the CWD proposal of having the deer/elk carcasses left in the field. The only issue that I have, is with the taxidermy portion of it. There are many hunters that enjoy doing their own European mounts, to them it is part of the hunt, experience, and enjoyment of the wildlife. A hunter applies for many, many years to draw an elk tag or an Any Deer tag in the Black Hills, now those hunters that do their own European Mounts will not be able to preserve their trophy themselves. Many hunters typically have a taxidermist that they have went to before, has seen the taxidermist work over and over and likes it, and also has a relationship built with them. Now they will have to take their trophy to a taxidermist, that they have no experience/relationship with or no idea how good that taxidermist work is. For a hunter having to take a trophy to a taxidermist in the Black Hills area, typically wouldn't be that big of a deal if you lived in that area. But for those that live out in the Eastern part of South Dakota, they will have to travel all the way across the state to get their mount back. At least let the hunter bring the horns attached to the head and cape home with themselves so they can use a taxidermist of their choice and feel comfortable with. After years of waiting/applying for an elk tag and spending the money on a shoulder mount, the last thing I would want to do is put a shoulder mount of an elk in the back of a pickup and drive down the highway across the state, while the wind is wrecking the cape on my mount.

---

**Paul Lepisto**

**Pierre SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

On behalf of the South Dakota Division of the Izaak Walton League of America I submit the following comments.

August 26, 2019

South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Commission  
523 East Capitol Avenue  
Pierre, SD 57501

Dear Commissioners,

The South Dakota Division of the Izaak Walton League of America (Division) appreciates this opportunity to comment on the proposed carcass transportation and disposal regulations to help prevent the spread of Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD). The Division is comprised of about 1,500 members from across the state, many of whom enjoy big game hunting.

The proposed changes include the transportation and disposal of deer and elk carcasses from other states and from hunting units in South Dakota where CWD has been confirmed. If approved the proposed regulations wouldn't go into effect until the 2020 hunting seasons.

The Division supports the Commission enacting the proposed interstate and intrastate rule changes to help reduce the spread of CWD. The Division also supports the Commission enacting the carcass disposal rule changes for hunters, processors and taxidermists.

However we are disappointed the existing rulemaking process does not allow the proposed regulations to go into effect for this fall's big game seasons. We fear this delay could lead to the further spread of CWD in the state. We urge a change in the rule making process that, in a critical situation such as this, would allow quicker implementation of rules that protect our fish, wildlife and other natural resources.

In addition to the proposed new regulations the Division repeats our previously stated concerns about the more than 70 captive cervid facilities in South Dakota. We share other organizations and agencies' fears about possible transmission of CWD from captive animals to wild cervids.

The Division recommends the Game, Fish and Parks (GFP) and the Department of Agriculture propose and adopt regulations requiring all captive cervid facilities to install a double 8 foot tall woven wire fence with at least four feet separation between the fences. We believe this would greatly reduce the chance of a captive animal escaping and mixing with our wild cervid populations. The Division also urges the GFP and the Department of Agriculture to develop a new regulation that prohibits shipment of captive cervids into South Dakota from states or areas with confirmed CWD endemic areas.

Another issue we believe still needs to be addressed is the areas of the state where waste management does not accept carcasses or carcass parts. This is a serious issue for many hunters, taxidermists or processors who don't live close to a permitted landfill. The Division supports the state making waste containers available in these areas that facilitate safe disposal of carcasses and/or carcass parts to help reduce the spread of CWD from an infected carcass.

The Division also urges the GFP and the Commission to establish a study on whether there is any potential for CWD to be transmitted via the use of urine-based attractants. Several states have already banned the use of urine-based lures. Urine used in these lures is collected from commercial deer facilities with no regulatory oversight and urine can contain the prion that carries CWD. The risk of contaminating our wild cervid populations greatly outweighs any benefit from the use of these products. Currently there is no way to detect if urine-based attractants are free of CWD. We urge the Commission to establish a study on this issue and its possible impacts to the wild cervid population in the state as soon as possible.

The Division commends the Commission and the GFP for the high level of public involvement on CWD and its long-term impact to the cervid populations in South Dakota. We believe this is an important component and it must continue.

The South Dakota Division of the Izaak Walton League of America again thanks you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed regulations regarding the prevention of the spread of Chronic Wasting Disease. We ask that we be kept informed on all future developments, public meetings and other communications on this issue as it moves forward.

Sincerely,

Kelly Kistner  
National IWLA President and President of the South Dakota Division  
Izaak Walton League of America  
603 Lakeshore Drive  
McCook Lake, SD 57049

605-232-2030 (H) – 712-490-1726 (C)  
iwlasdpresident@outlook.com

## Other

---

**Jordan Miller**

**Canton SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I am emailing to give my support in allowing higher magnification scopes on muzzle loaders.

I believe ethical shots will be easier to control with higher quality optics.

Thank you.

Jordan

---

**Matthew Walters**

**Sf SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

Please make it legal to use cut carp as bait for fishing makes no sense why you cant use a dead carp as bait please make this rule THANKS contact me with questions

---

**Jon Sorensen**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Trapping Check Time Reduction :

I am a trapper and i run a line in the fall that allows me to run part of it one day and the next part the second day with a 2 day check limit. If you would shorten the time i need to check on my traps and snares to 24 hrs then i would have to shorten my trap count by half and only be able to cover half of my line i had established over the years. Making me once again loose money on a already tough way of enjoying the outdoors in South Dakota. In the past when fur prices were large enough then yes the shorten time limit would not of affected nobody that much, but now since its already to a 48 window i have had to shorten my line once from a 3 day check in the past to a 2 day check and now shorten more. I would no longer feel it will be worth my time to even take part in the trapping season in South Dakota. Making me move onto other states for my enjoyment!

Thanks

Jon Sorensen

---

**Chris Tekrony**

**Castlewood SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I am opposed to shortening the Time to check traps to 24 hours. I have shared custody of my son and try to check traps every morning. Sometime I try to bring him which is after work 36 hours instead. Having to check traps at 4-5am before work is not an easy task either, if something goes wrong I dont get to check every trap until possibly after work. If I have vacation time I set in the morning and check after Im done, that way the animals arent piled up and are fresh for skinning after checking. Most nights I skin animals after work, or after checking the few I didnt check. I do run a short line of 12-30 traps and up to 40 snares when it snows. When snaring everything is entangled and dead asap. I have only had a raccoon dead once from the heat when I was a kid in our sweetcorn patch. I have video cameras on my traps to watch how the animals react. Most of the time they settle down after a few minutes, the trap startles them. Then the nap most of the time or get bored and dig around. If you use the correct equiptment they dont chew on themselves, or feel any pain. I know many people take a month every year to trap full time for a living and they run 2-3 lines in the day periods to create more territory meaning more catches in traps. I hope they allow at least a 36 hour timeframe if not leave the 48 hours. Yes there are people that only check once a week and this will not make them change anyway.

---

**Skyler Scott**

**Presho SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I oppose shortening the trap check time from 3 days to 1 day.

---

**James Vollmer**

**Avon SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

do not reduce trap checking time . with bad weather , sickness, accidents ECT. it is hard enough to run traps in 48 hours . I am 72 years old and do my best to check everyday sometime the weather and my health . dictate when an older or senior and check

---

**Richard Galbraith**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Trap Check Time Reduction - please do not reduce the current trap times. It's only going to cost us trappers more money for fuel and other expenses. You want to increase/encourage trapping in SD this is not the way to go.

---

**Karin Woltjer**

**Beresford SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

If you feel the need to trap, shortening the live trap time is a good thing.

---

**Keith Hickam**

**Timber Lake SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I feel that the current trap check times are adequate, changing to 24 hour check time would put hardship on trappers and be a burden on enforcement.

---

**Kyle Meier**

**Pierre SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Reducing trap check times to anything less than 48hours will end the trapping tradition significantly, especially for those who rely on it for income. A person can't justify spending 20 \$ in gas daily or more, nor has enough time to check them daily. Something will come up and having flexibility to plan your checks is essential. This law would only create violators.

---

**Gene Brockel**

**Mobridge SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I am a landowner not pleased with having to pay full price for deer license. Will be closing down land to outside hunting.

---

**Justin Murphy**

**Lyons SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

The proposal to add magnified scopes for muzzleloaders is a move in the wrong direction. This tag was intended to be a primitive hunt. Adding magnified scopes removes the primitive challenge. The argument that 1x scope availability is hard to come by is not a valid argument. There are multiple options for both 1x scopes as well as red dot setups. I strongly oppose this change and hope that the commission takes a hard look at this proposal.

---

**Greg Pettersen**

**Madison SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I am responding to the trap check time issue

I am opposed to this change. I run a fairly large trapline this would severely limit that. And my ability to trap farms and help out landowners which do see a benefit from me trapping their properties. And I am disappointed that two groups of people that are obviously against any trapping can even get this to be an issue we trappers do bring revenue into many small towns and the gfp thru license revenue other states due have different trapping laws but there geographical logistics and populations are different from ours South Dakota is a unique state thank you for your time from a proud South Dakotan trapper

---

**Gerald Shaw**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I oppose any magnification optic to be allowed on muzzleloader weaponry for the South Dakota Muzzleloader Season. As a weapon that is meant to be a more primitive form of harvesting deer, allowing a magnified optic on modern day muzzleloaders would essentially make it another rifle season, allowing individuals the ability to reach out to upwards of 500 yards, and likely an increase in wounded animals and un-recovered game animals. Even a 1x optic I feel takes away from what the season was about. The argument that 1X optics are impossible to find is hogwash. A simple google search for "1X Muzzleloader Scope" yielded numerous results.

---

**Dustin Atkins**

**Box Elder SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I would like to provide a little insight on the point of allowing a scope on muzzleloaders for hunting. I resided in North Carolina for most of my life and have just recently moved to South Dakota about two years ago. I can't seem to understand why South Dakota cannot understand that adding a scope to a muzzleloader isn't going to change harvest reports or decrease herd reports drastically. We have hunted with Scopes on our muzzleloaders in North Carolina for as long as I can remember and our herd reports have stayed the same, if not INCREASED. It blows my mind that this commission is so much against change. Initialize it itemily for a year, see how the harvest reports change, and if the results are drastic, remove the law from allowing scopes on muzzleloaders. Simple as that.

---

**Justin Allen**

**Pierre SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I'm opposed to allowing any scope other than 1x scope on muzzle loaders. If guys want to use muzzys with higher power scope do it during the regular rifle season. If this passes hunters will be shooting at deer further distances than they currently do now and it will not decrease wounding rates at all like i'm sure many will argue. SD GFP and SD hunters have to look at the big picture instead of the trend they are currently on of making hunting and killing game as easy as possible. I'm worried as harvest rates of deer across all seasons continue to grow GFP will have to increasingly limit season lengths and tag allocations thus limiting hunter opportunity and days spent in the field. Hunting isn't about how easy we can make it to kill something. As a avid muzzy hunter I'm against allowing powered scopes. Thanks for your time

---

**Michael Krein**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I think the regulations on scope power for muzzleloader during the muzzleloader season should be changed from fixed 1x scopes to scopes of either 1x4 or 1x6 power.

---

**Dana Rogers**

**Hill City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

My comment is on the proposal to add higher magnification optics to Muzzleloaders. First off, the petitioners argument is a fallacy. There are opportunities to purchase 1x scopes in several places. 2nd, just because he happens to say he had difficulty getting one is no reason to change an entire rule. His muzzleloader came with open ( buck horn sights) and Red Dot or other halographic sights abound. If he wants to hunt with a muzzleloader he should have been prepared to hunt, not make excuses and try and change an entire season simply to suit himself.

Commissioner Bies brought up the aspect of Technology creep and the primitive nature of the Muzzleloader season during the Petition vote. I applaud that and whichever commissioner voted no to begin with. The fact this petition was pushed forward perplexes me greatly. My personal opinion and concern is the entire premise of the petition is not correct and keeping technology creep from causing seasons to change so dramatically that we lose them or the inherent value of them. By that I mean with archery and muzzle loaders, technology continues to move forward and is driven by manufacturers or people wanting to make things "easier". Once things become too "easy", harvest increases, more people are putting pressure on the resources and pretty soon GFP will then want to or have to act to reduce the impact. Thus losing the opportunity or reducing the opportunity through draw pressure. This 'should' be a short range type situation (IMO). With a variable scope on modern muzzle loaders my personal concern is it pushes ranges further. This is a line in the sand so to speak. We already have an any weapons season (rifle tags). 2nd and 3rd order effects to every change abound.

If someone doesn't like the rules already in place for a "primitive weapons season" like archery or muzzleloader, why in the heck are they even applying for said tag? The commission should NOT be in the business of making things "easier" but looking at decisions as a whole.

I'm sorry the petitioner's eyes aren't as good as they were when he was when he was 18 but mine aren't either. Allowing 1-4 or 1-6X scopes is totally unnecessary and a terrible move for the integrity of the Muzzleloader season.

All the petitioner would have to do is allow or WORK hard to get closer to the game. Making things easier is a TERRIBLE reason to make a change.

PLEASE vote this proposal down and keep our Muzzleloader season as it is!

---

**Carl Brakke**

**Presho SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

Would like to voice my disappointment in the state of the water below the dam in pierre. We camped at #3 this last weekend and was amazed with the amount of dead fish and the smell of it. We boated on sat and wondered if there's a way not to have this happen. Curious, thanks for your time. Carl B



---

**Carol Risdall**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I have visited Pierre in past to scuba dive and enjoy downstream activities. I had noticed dead fish before but never to the extent I noticed around July 4th 2019. The stench of dead fish was every where. The dead fish numbers were actually more underwater, as seen scuba diving, then above, so I think things will just get worse as th bodies decompose and come up to the surface.

I have been to areas with dams where netting prevents the fish from going though the intake. It seems like a viable solution. At this point netting for clean up , rather than prevention, might help with the stench and decay of rotting fish in order to help keep the area bringing in visitors for recreational purposes. Ideally netting would be both for clean up and prevention of more fish getting sucked through the intakes.

It seems the end result will be a huge financial loss for our parks in the Oahe area if we allow more fish to die. It probably has already turned away visitors for this summer.

If there is any way I can make a difference- committee or letters I can write, or people I can contact- in order to help get funding to clean up our river, please direct me in the right direction.

A concerned citizen,  
Carol Risdall

---

**Dale Singer**

**Spearfish SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I am greatly in favor of allowing 1 to 4 power, or 1 to 6 power optics for muzzleloader seasons! The season occurs after hunters have been allowed to shoot at deer from greater distances with high powered optics, then the guy with a muzzleloader has to try to come behind and make shots on deer that are already skittish and gun shy. Muzzleloader hunters need to have the opportunity to and the availability to find and use the better options for optics! Thanks.

---

**Tim Ferrell**

**Sturgis SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I support a change that would allow muzzleloaders to use 1-4x or 1-6x powered scopes. It is in fact hard to find a proper 1x only option. It would also help to ensure better shot placement for a cleaner more ethical kill.

---

**Marty Keegan**

**Yankton SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

muzzleloader optics, I am for this change.  
thank you

---

**Mark Peterson**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Muzzleloader 1x Scope - totally against this. The muzzleloader season success rate will increase dramatically if this is allowed. Muzzleloader hunting should be open sights only and there are plenty of 1x scopes available if one knows how to use google. Peep sights are another great option that are currently legal.

Now if a person had vision issues I could see a medical exception similar to the exception used to allow disabled hunters to shoot from the vehicle.

---

**Gary Soupir**

**Watertown SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Hello,

This is just my opinion. But I feel more magnification means more longer range shots will be taken. With my 1x scope it's hard to shoot my muzzleloader past 150. With the same gun and a BDC scope I'll shoot it out to 300. Scopes make all the difference plain and simple. Not too mention more deer will be harvested due to higher success of a magnified scope. As far as crippling less deer.... sure you'll cripple less under 150 with a 4x vs a 1x. But guys will be taking longer shots with 4x. But you'll be crippling more deer over 150 with a 4x that guys wouldn't even attempt with a 1x. If you're worried about crippling less deer try working on your load development to be more accurate or hunt harder and get closer. I feel we are very fortunate to be able to use a 1x as an aiming reference. Sure 1x changed to 4x isn't that big of a change. But where does it end??? What's gonna stop guys from whining in 5 years saying they want 9x or 12x next??? The any deer muzzleloader tag is my favorite tag! Call me selfish but waiting 4-5 years on average to draw is long enough for me. If rules keep changing you'll make it easier to be success-full then you'll get more people applying. More magnification makes the firearm more accurate at longer rangers = more success = more people wanting to apply = lower draw odds = longer waits to hunt. No thank you! Please leave the scope restrictions as is. Thank you for your time and consideration.

---

**James (Jim) Twamley**

**Parker SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

First let me say that hunting muzzleloader was originally set up as a Primitive Weapons Season and was set up as an Antlerless Tag. As the deer population increased this was changed to allow for 500 Any Deer tags and was then later increased to a 1000 tags. This was mainly do to hunters not being able to draw a rifle tag in their preferred unit and seeing this as a way to hunt their preferred unit with a firearm.

The 1 power scope was added originally to allow Handicapped Muzzleloader hunters, who for some reason, were not able to use the sights mounted on the muzzleloaders. It was later expanded to allow all muzzleloader hunters to use them. This was a determination that was allowed because the wanting to keep this season as a Primitive Weapons season and to allow hunters the opportunity to do so. In addition it was felt that limiting the optics on the muzzleloader to 1 power scopes it would also provide for a more humane kill with reduced wounding rates due to hunters taking shots at longer ranges.

By allowing variable power scopes you will effectively increase the shot ranges of these weapons thus making it another rifle season instead of a primitive weapons season its intended to be. All you have to do is look at the states that allow greater than 1 power scoped mounted muzzleloaders, to see how its affected their seasons.

The Commission has been saying that they want to allow more hunters to get their preferred unit tag, but by making it easier for hunters to use a magnifying scoped mounted muzzleloader to harvest a statewide "Buck" tag will only cause more restrictions on those counties that currently takes a lot of Preference Points to draw. This has been proven by the Departments own statistics as to how the number of available muzzleloader tags increased so did the interest of the unsuccessful Rifle Season (Any Weapon) hunters. The percentages of muzzleloader hunters who only hunt with is muzzleloader is less then 25%, the remaining 75% are dissatisfied rifle hunters looking for a way to have another opportunity to draw a tag and the whole month of December to fill it.

Finally, personally if the Commission feels that a change is needed to the Optics requirements currently used on a muzzleloader, I would suggest that the state adopts the same rule as in Colorado. In Colorado they only allow iron sights, which include Peep Sights and sights that have a fiber optics incorporated in them. They also only allow loose powder (no pellets), the projectile must contact the rifling on the barrel (no sabots), no electronic ignition devices but do allow 209 primers, #11 primers, and musket caps for ignition.

By incorporating these changes the Department and the Commission would go a long way in returning the Muzzleloader Season back to the Primitive Weapons season that it was historically intended to be.

Changes just to make it easier to do is not in the best interest of the hunter or the game animals we pursue. I say this as a person who is a Bowhunter who also hunts with a Muzzleloader and rifle hunts.

---

**Brooks Goeden**

**Yankton SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

In my personal opinion, I can not support a change to the muzzleloader optics rules. There is no need to change the rules because of a lack of options for 1 power optics. If you ask me please leave rules for muzzleloader optics as is.

Thank you for your time and consideration

---

**Scott Johnson**

**Fort Pierre SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I support allowing up to a 6x scope on muzzle loader deer season. I myself have tried to acquire a 1x scope with no results. Due to the limited amount of any deer tags (1000) I don't think it will have much affect on the harvesting of more deer but will be much more accurate to pin point bullet placement and make a humane kill. Thank you for your time. Scott Johnson

---

**Tom Braun**

**Hot Springs SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

After attending CWD forum in Hot S. a few months ago, reading about CWD programs, and now seeing proposed rules to control its spread--I commend you! However, it has been stated repeatedly in many states, that feeding big game, and baiting, help spread CWD, and should be avoided or banned. Yet in this same package of rules and changes, YOU PROPOSE TO EXTEND THE "BAITING SEASON?!!!!?? If any change is made, it should be to BAN BAITING, NOT ENCOURAGE IT! In addition to assisting the spread of disease, it's an ethical question. How much more is going to be done to make it EASIER to kill any big game animal, especially in archery seasons, where the original intent was to be challenged?

---

**Greg Stuebner**

**Webster SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I oppose the use of magnification optics ( variable power scopes ) on muzzle loader specific seasons. The whole point of the season is a limited range specific option of public enjoyment. IF objective was to kill deer, then we would add more tags in rifle season. IF you want to use a scoped muzzleloader, then use one during the regular firearms seasons, not modify this season. Aging eyes is not a valid reason. Either is ethical shot placement, because if you cannot place an ethical shot, you should not be out hunting until you can- regardless of harvest method. Please see these vendors:

<https://vortexoptics.com/catalog/product/view/id/3447>

<https://www.natchezss.com/thompson-center-hawken-hunter-muzzleloader-scope-1x32mm-matte-black.html>

<https://www.natchezss.com/weaver-kaspa-hunting-series-rifle-scopes-1x20mm-88-4-13-matte.html>

---

**Chris Manson**

**Brookings SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I'm against any changes from the current muzzle loader scope restrictions.

---

**Bret Brown**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I don't really understand wanting to restrict the scope size, you only get one shot and I don't want to wound a deer and watch it run off to die knowing the odds of recovery are slim. One problem with this restriction is that I'm guessing there aren't any really good scopes in the proposed optics. Let's not forget that a great 3x9 scope isn't going to increase the range of even a modern day muzzleloader to more than a couple hundred yards.

---

**Norman Carda**

**Yankton SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I am in favor of allowing 1x6power scope for muzzle loader hunting.

---

**Jeff Sorensen**

**Viborg SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I support allowing scopes with magnification for use on muzzle loading rifles.

---

**Michael Podhradsky**

**White SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

The scopes to 6 power on muzzleloaders should be allowed. It only increases a better shot placement.

---

**Michael Podhradsky**

**White SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I think this new way of deer hunting drawings is a joke. Non of my family got any tags they applied for. I was very disappointed. This was a terrible idea and needs to be redone.

---

**Jeff Sorensen**

**Viborg SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I am in favor of allowing scopes with magnification for muzzleloader rifle hunting.

---

**Chet Barney**

**Vermillion SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I support the proposed change to allow for telescopic sights on muzzleloaders. If not, muzzleloader season should be put before the rifle hunts, and during the rut.

---

**Rick Hanger**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I am opposed to allowing magnification in scopes for the muzzleloader season. The reason given for the change is bogus. Non magnified scopes are easy to find. I checked in Sioux Falls and found many available options. I also checked on line and found a myriad of options available. Muzzleloader season is supposed to be harder. The whole purpose is to be primitive. I believe it should be restricted to open sights without any electronics magnified or otherwise. Anyone who wants to use a big scope on their inline can do so during the regular firearms seasons. Muzzleloader season should be kept traditional and primitive. Technology is taking the challenge out of many of our pursuits. I think GFP should be helping to hold on to traditions, not setting them aside for technology. Please do not allow magnification during the muzzleloader season. Change just for the sake of change is always a fools errand.

---

**Ron Laughlin**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Re: allow 1x-4x, or 1x-6x optic because 1x not available.

There are several 1x scope available for purchase.

1. Sightmark 1x at amazon
2. Weaver 1x at Natchez
3. Sightmark 1x at Sportsmans Guide
4. 1x at Thompson Center
5. 1x scope on eBay.

---

**Chuck Jensen**

**Onida SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I'm against the muzzleloader scope change. In 30 seconds in typed 1x muzzleloader scope into google and can up with several options. The scopes are out there so don't fall into that notion. You guys talk about wounding loss but instead of guys shooting out to 100 yards with 1x scopes you will now have guys shooting out to 200 plus. Wounding loss isn't going to decrease. If guys want use higher powered muzzleloaders they can use them during the rifle season. You can't always try to make hunting as easy as possible and this proposal is just that. Leave the scope restriction as is at 1x scope.

---

**Chris Streit**

**Oregon IL**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I realize this is too little too late, as I was unaware of the comment period until after changes for nonresident archery deer hunting regulations had been changed.

I'm from IL, I love hunting in SD. I will not be able to hunt SD this year due to the timing of the changes. My work doesn't allow me to change my vacation days. I had requested a week off to bow hunt west river deer from Sept 15-21. Then I receive and email that I can't. The season dates were set, then you changed the rules in the middle of the game! Now I'm screwed out of my vacation time and I can't go hunting where I planned, and I only applied for preference points in other western states. My only option is NE OTC, so I guess that's where I'll be spending my money this year.

So what gives? Why the late change? And why target NR?

You wouldn't do this to NR pheasant hunters.

---

**Mark Smedsrud**

**Hartford SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I oppose changing the optics requirements for muzzleloader rifles during muzzleloader season. The statement that it is difficult to find legal 1 power optics is simply not true. I bought a 1 power scope at Scheels in Sioux Falls. I also saw many for sale online. Please keep this requirement as is. Part of the challenge of hunting deer with a muzzleloader is getting close enough for a good shot. Thank you.

---

**John Rolloff**

**New Ulm MN**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I bought a seasonal license in April of this year. The place I bought it from said they were having problems with the machines. Well I got a license, but I never looked at it and just put in my wallet. It turns out it has someone else's name on it. It is for someone in Nebraska. I would like to find out what my options are. You can call me at 507-359-2259 Thank you

---

**Dale Gregg**

**Whitewood SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Muzzle loader optics. Having had the opportunity to muzzle loader hunt in several states. I can attest the positive of having a powered scope. Rarely does one get the opportunity to harvest with open sites given that most opportunities are in low light situations morning and evening. Secondly the season dictates that in SD there is a high % of lack of sun and winter conditions. Open sites or red dot does not provide a quality site picture and limited range. Finally, the likely hood of a poor shot is reality. What I'm not in favor of is 350yd muzzle loaders. Your basic in line may be good to 200 max. Currently the lack of quality and availability of Zero power scopes creates very limited for us hunters. Thanks

---

**Anthony Filholm**

**Brookings SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I am opposed to changing the current optics rules for muzzle loaders. There are 1X scopes available online. It took me less than a week to get one. It is supposed to be a primitive weapons season. People will be inclined to unethically take longer shots with higher power optics.



---

**Jason Smith**

**Pierre SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I AM IN SUPPORT OF CHANGING THE MUZZELOADER LAWS TO ALLOW LOW POWER SCOPES. THE COMMISSION HAS MADE THE DECISION TO MAKE A SEPERATE MUZZLELODER ANY TAG SO PLEASE ALLOW THOSE THAT DRAW TO USE A SCOPE. AS WE ALL AGE IT IS GETTING TOUGHER TO USE IRON SIGHTS AND RED DOT SCOPES THAT COVER MOST OF THE ANIMAL UP AT 100 YARDS.

---

**Pat Malcomb**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

The first deer draw is complete using the new draw plan. I for one don't like it and if you are going to keep it there needs to be changes. Personally I think it was a flop. One thing that needs to change is the second choice option, If my first choice is west river deer any deer why does my second choice also have to be west river deer? Why can't my second choice be black hills or muzzleloader? I only hunt one county and if I can't get my first choice I want a chance at another tag. Then second season I put East River and same story I only hunt one county so my second choice why do I have to put another east river county? Why not black hills for my second choice or muzzloader? If you are not changing back which I am in favor of you need to set up the current application system so you can apply for any season as choice two and not the same season as your first choice.

Thank you Pat Malcomb

---

**Ron Laughlin**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

RE: allowing 1-4 scope for muzzle loader.

Petitioner say 1x scope not available for purchase.

Here is one available for purchase :

<https://www.cheaperthandirt.com/sightmark-core-sx-1x24mm-shotgun-scope-sm13063/FC-812495020162.html>

Here is another: <https://www.amazon.com/Thompson-Center-Rifle-Scope-1X32Mm/dp/B000JP4K4S>

Here is another: <https://www.natchezss.com/weaver-kaspa-hunting-series-rifle-scopes-1x20mm-88-4-13-matte.html>

Thank you.  
Ron

---

**Lonny Kracht**

**Sturgis SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

This if the first time in 48 consecutive years of hunting that I have been unsuccessful in the 1st and 2nd draws for a deer tag (other than archery). It is what it is I guess. Don't know what to think.

---

**Rod Vaughn**

**Fort Thompson SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I live in Buffalo County South Dakota. There is now a large and viable wild turkey population within the county. Please open Buffalo County to Spring Turkey Hunting. There are several of us who would like to shotgun hunt turkeys in the spring on our land and on the Corps taken lands within Buffalo County. Thank you.

---

**Bryan Johnson**

**Fort Thompson SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

Add Spring Turkey shotgun season in Buffalo County, SD.

---

**David Schwantz**

**Elko New Market MN**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I told you to remove me from you r mailing list after you r stupid changes to the hunting laws and lottery. I will never hunt SD again.

---

**Rolf Johnson**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Is there any way to stop people from disposing of their deer carcasses by dumping them in the hills. They obviously know it is wrong because they never leave the leg with the tag. Could a message of some kind be included with the license ?

---

**Aaron Vaughn**

**Fort Thompson SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

Can Buffalo County please be added to the spring turkey season? In the last 5 years I have seen a steady increase in the turkey population in buffalo County, and I would love the opportunity to hunt closer to home with my son. Thank you very much for your consideration.

---

**Jim Jessen**

**Woonsocket SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

My comments are in regard to the change of the dead line for East River Deer being moved way up. I think the commission should of done a better job of informing the public about this change through whatever means. I completely missed the first drawing because I had no idea the date had been moved up and had the GF&P had my E-mail address in there system all screwed up or maybe I would of known. So, I ended up put in for the second drawing, which I put in for as soon as possible because I missed the first drawing. Well, I didn't draw a tag during this drawing, even though I put in early. I thought it used to be first come first serve on leftover licenses, but apparently not, anyway if there going to change something that's been the same for many years they need to do a heck of a lot better job of letting the public know.

---

**Susan Braunstein**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I know it is impossible for this year but please don't consider the nest predator program for next year. It is a cruel and non-productive method to increase habitat for commercial hunting enterprises. Thank you.

---

**Jaleana Dixon**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Adam Blanchette**

**Cadott WI**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I have never hunted your state but have always wanted to try the early season and chase after a velvet buck. Here in Wisconsin our season opens later not allowing for the chance at a velvet deer so the Western states have always been a great option for an early season hunting opportunity. It's sad to see a tradition change unless the justification for doing so is for a true benefit to the natural resource being managed. This feels more like a complaint of local hunters against the non resident hunters.

I feel that applying the new non resident start date will gravely impact your states license sales, which in turn impacts a lot of local businesses that the out of state hunters utilize and support as well. If your deer herd is struggling and needs less pressure then I get that and support that, but there are other options to achieving that. There might be some adverse side effects to this rule that will decrease funding for your department and cities that may outweigh the issue of non resident hunters being able to start the bow season when the residents can.

What is the main driving reason for this proposed change? Resident hunter complaints? or is it truly a deer management move that is intended to help the herd in a way? Why not have a draw system in place if it is herd management related?

Regardless good luck on your decision, hopefully the outcome is what you desire and if not that it reverts back to the way it was so that I can bring my now 9 year old son out there to chase some early season velvet bucks in the near future when he is ready. Thanks and have a great day!

---

**Kevin Bryant**

**Box Elder SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I took a tour of Ft Sisseton last week and was very impressed of the fort, the grounds and especially with our tour guide Malinda. She was very informative of the history of the fort and made the tour most enjoyable. Thank you.

---

**Leonard Spomer**

**Pierre SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I am commenting on the petition to increase the muzzleloader optics to something greater than 1x.

The petitioner is correct in saying that most 1x scopes have been discontinued.

However there is a better option in the form of red/green dot sights with 1x magnification. The 2019 Vortex catalog lists at least four 1x red/green dot sights that would work on a muzzleloader. There are literally scores of red/green dot sights available from multiple manufacturers.

The reason I oppose changing the magnification to a higher power rating is that the muzzleloader technology is changing rapidly, and making them more lethal at greater distances.

The new 2019 CVA Paramount muzzleloader is capable of very long shots. Their own catalog says "provides the higher velocities necessary for killing shots at 300 yards and beyond".

If you allow higher scope magnification along with the higher velocity muzzleloaders than you have just created another "rifle season".

Let's keep the muzzleloader season as it is.

Thank you.

---

**Rich Simonsen**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Just a suggestion. If the state chooses to stick with the new deer application process, (not a fan), you might want to consider going to a highest preference draws first point system like Colorado versus weighted. For some of the harder to get tags, (Custer deer, refuge deer, etc.) there is very little reason to keep paying the \$5 for preference points, if it really does not help your chances. This will be a lost revenue source for the state.

---

**Chad Carlson**

**Ottumwa IA**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

My name is Chad and I live in Ottumwa, Iowa. I am 34 years old and a City Public Works employee. I'm reluctant to say I'm an "avid" archer and outdoorsman, but I think most would say I am. I am known as a quiet, polite and rational guy and I would like to offer my level-headed, honest insight of how these new changes will not only affect myself, but all those in our hunting group who love to hunt South Dakota. I hope you will read my entire letter to the end.

Like many big game hunters, our core group of friends and family "play" the western big game points draw. Every spring, year after year, we put our names into those many hats in hopes of drawing that coveted tag. The reality of the matter is, it's a very rare occasion that any of us actually pull one of those tags. Regardless, every spring it's easy for big dreams to run rampant. Despite those big dreams, come August, when all the draw results are finally tallied, we more often than not are all left looking for a "Fallback Plan". Over the years, this "fallback plan" has become more of an annual event; to hunt South Dakota archery deer, and we have grown to absolutely LOVE IT! A guaranteed archery tag that we can purchase late summer/early fall AFTER results are

in from all the western draws, reasonable tag prices, more public ground than a person could cover in a lifetime and for us at least, a very enjoyable, relaxing experience staying in small town hotel, eating a good steak and cold beer at the end of the day. It's an awesome way to kick off the fall hunting season and we have truly come to love hunting South Dakota.

I receive email publications from the South Dakota Game and Fish and I've been trying to stay up to date on the proposed changes. I am quite disappointed (and confused) to see that several of the proposed changes have been adopted.

1.) Application Deadline. Creating a deadline of August 1st for those of us hunting public lands is tough, and a little inconvenient, but... it's doable. However, changing the deadline to April 1st, will all but rule hunters like us out. At the time of writing this, I can think of 11 of my friends and family who currently hunt South Dakota. In my one group alone, we have give or take 7-8 hunters. For all of us, one of the great aspects of this hunt is the flexibility in acquiring a tag. Every-single-one of us (in our core group) puts in for harder draw tags in multiple western states. We typically won't even see results for those tags until May, June, July and in some instances August. Speaking for myself, I make a modest income and am only granted so many days of vacation a year, resulting in 1 hunting trip per year. I feel like my situation represent a LARGE population of hunters. If the deadline is moved up to April 1st, I WILL NOT be applying for a South Dakota archery tag and doubt anyone else in our group will either. It is very disappointing.

2.) Start Date. What is the reasoning behind pushing the start date back? I can "kinda" understand if it's to accommodate Residents, but a whole month? I'm pretty well versed with Midwest and western state regulations. I can not recall a single state that delays a start for Non-Residents? Is that even legal? Nonetheless, our group has hunted all over the western 1/3 of the state. Yes, there are hunters, but NEVER have we found a piece of public land that is overwhelmed by hunters, Resident or Non-Resident. Where our group has now hunted for the last 7 years, it's EXTREMELY RARE we even see another hunter.

Like I mentioned earlier, this trip has become our annual "start" of Hunting Season. By October 1st, deer season has now started in Iowa, Wisconsin & Minnesota (where our hunting group is from). We are all avid hunters and by then we're going to be chasing the deer we've been scouting all year. Last years September 1 start date was a real teaser! We love chasing muleys in Velvet!!!!

As for money goes, quite honestly I don't care at all about hunting tags and state revenues... honestly I kinda hope the state is shooting itself in the foot. What I do care about and am afraid for, are the local economies of small towns like the one we have come to love. When I call to book 4 hotel rooms every year, and the hotel owner says "I've been waiting for your call!", that's saying something about the importance of us pumping our money into that family owned business. When we go to the ONLY still-running bar/restaurant in town and the owner/bartender immediately remembers us (maybe not by name) but remembers us and knows we are there to hunt, he is genuinely HAPPY to see us, and takes the time to talk with us... that says something about the importance of us spending our money in his business. I honestly fear for those small businesses that certainly benefit from our out-of-state money.

I HAVE TO believe our group of hunters represent a large group of Non-Resident hunters. The changes made seem peculiar and I have a hard time understanding the reasoning. Our draw to hunt South Dakota is the Opportunity of the hunt. For the last week +, since we saw the changes were to take affect, our core group has been in constant chatter... the changes feel like a low-blow. For sure, 5 of our core group guys (including me) WILL NOT be hunting South Dakota this year and the remainder of the guys are currently at-a-loss. Half the fun is hunting as a group. I would not be surprised at all if everyone in our core group say "the hell with". It's very disappointing.

I'm really not one to complain... I'm much more of a go-with-the-flow type and understand that change is inevitable, but this has us all shaking our heads.

I appreciate you taking the time to read my concerns and hope you will keep them in mind.

---

**Tom Rakow**

**Silver Lake MN**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I just saw these changes. I have loved hunting South Dakota with Archery for the last 14 years. With these changes I will begin looking to other states to spend my bow hunting dollars

---

**Dean Bortz**

**Woodruff WI**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I know this is probably going to go straight to your circular data file, but I'm writing anyway to say that I am very disappointed (you can interpret that to mean extremely frustrated and beyond) that South Dakota changed its non-resident archery deer application / season process. Your previous system allowed us the flexibility to make a trip to South Dakota if our schedules opened up in the fall, something we wouldn't necessarily know prior to this year's Aug. 1 and next year's April application deadlines. I really can't imagine why you would ditch your previous process unless you're looking for fewer non-resident archery deer hunters. If that's your goal, you've succeeded. I filed my comments opposing the change prior to the deadline for your earlier public comment period on this proposal. Obviously I must have been on the short end of sentiment. I had hoped to be able to sneak in an archery deer hunting trip to the Black Hills National Forest in October and would have stayed in Hill City or at Mountain Meadows, where I've stayed in the past. I wouldn't know if I would be able to make that trip until late September or early October. Under the previous system, I could still have applied for an archery license at that point. Now, no. I'm not going to gamble the cost of an archery license prior to Aug. 1 this year, or in April next year, not knowing whether I'll actually be able to make the trip. That was the real beauty of your previous system. Those of us with flexible schedules could count on the West River Region or Black Hills for a quick four- to five-day hunt if time allowed. Now that idea is out the window. I have introduced a good friend to turkey hunting and archery deer hunting in the Black Hills. Shane has made many turkey hunting trips with me over the years and has now been to your state for two archery deer hunts with me. This fall he was going to bring his wife – Amber also bowhunts – to Rapid City / Hill City for her first trip. They were planning on the last week of September. Guess what? They are no longer going. With Shane's work, October is a difficult time to get away. Late September is his only option for an out-of-state bow hunt. He'll now be looking for a different state to visit.

I have a hard time believing South Dakota is overrun with non-resident bowhunters to the point that you need to make this change. During the two most recent seasons that I bowhunted in the Black Hills with Shane the only other hunters we saw were resident rifle elk hunters. If we walked into a store or restaurant wearing camo people would look at us and ask if we were elk hunting. They would get a very puzzled look on their faces when we told them we were bowhunting deer. Their reply would typically be that they didn't know of many people who bowhunted deer.

I also take huge exception to the fact that you're telling me that I can't hunt in the Black Hills National Forest in September. While the BBNF is within SD borders, that forest belongs to every U.S. citizen, not the state of South Dakota. That's not right.

I used to be a huge fan of your state. I started turkey hunting in South Dakota in 1999 or 2000 and have been out there just about every spring for turkey hunting. I think it was 2004 or 2005 when I drew my first pronghorn tag and Black Hills rifle deer tag. Your season frameworks, license / application system and web site always made sense and were easy to use. But I just cannot support this latest move. You've taken away the one thing that allowed us to make a "short notice" bowhunting trip to your state and the closing off of the national forest and BLM lands to non-residents in September is simply un-American.



---

**Jonathan Way**

**Osterville ME**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I just returned from an amazing 3.5 week trip out west including 2-3 days in Wind Cave NP and Custer SP. I was amazed at how many bison there were and loved the experience other than seeing all of the fences and wish they had more room to roam... I understand because of these fences that some animals - most notably the ungulates especially the elk - have to be managed to desired population sizes but I find it incomprehensible that cougars are actively hunted in a world famous state park like Custer. And looking at the 2018 kills ("harvest") many of the lions killed statewide were there. I know the folks at South Dakota Fish and Parks understand cougar/carnivore biology and can't believe that predator hunting is allowed there. That completely changes my opinion of this 71,000 acre park and how it is managed. Cougars live at low numbers and the park is not that big compared to their biological needs. Why can't they have this one refuge?

And, also, I spent over a week on South Dakota on my trip and also find it repulsive that lions can be killed year-round outside of the Black Hills. What about the Badlands? The thought that every time a lion steps out of Badlands NP, another great place, that it can be killed year-round is unbelievable. Please consider wildlife lovers when designing such needless hunting seasons. There is no need for a year-round season on these animals except in defense of property

---

**Troy Miller**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I just wanted to give my thoughts on the new system.

I typically just draw one deer tag per year (either east river, west river, or black hills). I try to accumulate preference points if I'm not hunting a particular unit that year. This year I wanted to try west river for the first time and I had 3 preference points. I didn't want to run the risk of drawing two tags, so I applied for west river only thinking that I would probably draw a tag with my preference points but if not I would reapply for a different unit in the 2nd draw. Well, looking at the map there is pretty much jack squat left for the 2nd draw. This new system is going to encourage everyone to apply for multiple units in the first draw and run the risk of drawing two tags even if they don't really want 2, because the alternative might be that they don't draw any tags (as I found out). The old system was better with the drawing occurring at different times because if you didn't draw a tag for one season, you still had a fair shot at another. The 2nd draw appears to be a joke (nothing left).

---

**Clay Pederson**

**Morristown SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

Looks like SDG&F is a fee hunting operation with a raffle like this.

Why don't you utilize those PR Funds correctly and you wouldn't need supplemental raffles!!!

---

**Jeremy Scegura**

**Holdingsford SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I was considering a raffle donation for the hunt for habitat. I am a non-resident but have many friends in the state, and spend a fair amount of time fishing and hunting in SD. While reading the raffle rules I see that non-residents are limited to one winner on option one. So as I understand it, if my name is the second to be drawn, and the first was another non-resident, I don't win. Remember that I paid double for my ticket as a non-resident. Ridiculous! This is a RAFFLE, not a tag drawing. I understand that many states give preferential treatment to their residents on tag drawing, and I get that. This is going too far, and I hope other non-residents read the rules and are smart enough not to buy your raffle tickets. Despite my personal desire to support wildlife project fundraising, the way you have set this up is so irritating that I can't get past it.

Please pass on this note to whoever is in charge of organizing this raffle.

---

**Chad Bjorgaard**

**Bemidji MN**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I hate the new system. Now, instead of waiting and biding my time to draw, I may never draw. This system effectively eliminates that. I could have 20 preference points and still not draw. This is supposed to help with hunter recruitment? By increasing people's frustration? If I would have known you were going to change it like this, I would have never started buying preference points in the first place. I have always been happy with the State of South Dakota and the way their licensing system is run. But, this, in my eyes, is a horrible fail and is a complete disservice to the loyal outdoorspeople that frequent your state. I finally had enough points saved where my son and I should have had a very good chance of drawing, instead, someone who had less points than us drew instead. I guess we will start exploring another state to hunt that isn't about participation trophies for people that haven't earned them. Shameful!!

---

**Loren Clayton**

**Omaha NE**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Our NE Douglas County BassMasters Club was informed that the length limit regulations for bass have changed for your "Trophy Lakes." We would encourage the State of SD to change them back to what they have been for years in the past. Our club holds club tournaments in IA, MO, KS, and OK. Our records consistently show that we catch more lbs. of fish when we fish either Francis Case or Lake Sharpe, and Roy Lake. It's the only reason we drive for 6 hours to fish in your state. We feel after 2 yrs after the regulations change, the fishing will be the same as the other states where we fish. Multiply that times the number of other clubs going to your state for the same reasons and that adds up to a lot of revenue not being spent. We are associated with BassMasters and thus are obligated to "catch and release." We have a lot of fun, because we usually all catch our five fish tournament limit, weigh in, and then release them. We tell others how much fun we have, show pictures, and tell the lengths/weights. That in and of its self draws more tourism. We ask "the powers to be" to please reconsider changing the regulations back to what they used to be. We thank you!

---

**Loren Clayton**

**Omaha NE**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Our NE Douglas County BassMasters Club was informed that the length limit regulations for bass have changed for your "Trophy Lakes." We would encourage the State of SD to change them back to what they have been for years in the past. Our club holds club tournaments in IA, MO, KS, and OK. Our records consistently show that we catch more lbs. of fish when we fish either Francis Case or Lake Sharpe, and Roy Lake. It's the only reason we drive for 6 hours to fish in your state. We feel after 2 yrs after the regulations change, the fishing will be the same as the other states where we fish. Multiply that times the number of other clubs going to your state for the same reasons and that adds up to a lot of revenue not being spent. We are associated with BassMasters and thus are obligated to "catch and release." We have a lot of fun, because we usually all catch our five fish tournament limit, weigh in, and then release them. We tell others how much fun we have, show pictures, and tell the lengths/weights. That in and of its self draws more tourism. We ask "the powers to be" to please reconsider changing the regulations back to what they used to be. We thank you!

---

**Virginia Matney**

**Atlantic Beach NY**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Please HALT this CRUEL bounty trapping program on PUBLIC lands!

I am a taxpayer and I absolutely abhor this horrific practice in any state, in any form, on any public lands.

I will NEVER visit your state as long as this viscous policy remains in effct.

---

**Kevin Crupi**

**Marquette MI**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I was very disappointed to read the Game Fish and Parks Department recently approved a date extension for trapping on public lands and has increased the amount of animals allowed to be trapped, killed, and have their tails cut off to 50,000. There's no excuse for cruel trapping in an advanced society like the 21st Century U.S.

Already, over 22,000 animals such as raccoons, opossums, red foxes and badgers have been caught and killed by traps in South Dakota, where trappers receive a \$10 bounty for every animal tail turned in. Animals caught in traps sometimes suffer for days before the trapper returns and kills the animal. Non-target species and even some pets are caught in cruel traps.

Killing programs like this barbaric, state-sponsored trapping bounty hunt are cruel, out-dated and simply do not work. A recent study in the journal Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment found that there's little scientific evidence that killing predators actually accomplishes the goal of protecting other species.

These killing programs are ineffective and only serve as a way to reward and encourage trappers and hunters instead of promoting non-lethal solutions. Wildlife species should be revered not only because they are sentient beings but because the health of our ecosystems depend on them. Please reverse your recent decision to extend cruel trapping in South Dakota. Thank you.

---

**Matthew Nelson**

**Webster SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Muzzleloader Optics Change HB 1006

I am in favor of muzzleloader hunters to use 1-4x or 1-6x powered optics during the muzzleloader deer season due to the fact that it is hard to find a legal 1x power scope. I also feel that there would be less deer wounded having better optics. Tags for this season are sparse, so I feel that bettering the deer harvest odds would be greater and hunters would be more successful and have more interest in applying for this season in the future having better optics on their muzzleloaders.

---

**Mu Naw**

**Huron Sd SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Dan Buehner**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I'm writing regarding the proposed muzzleloader optics change. I support allowing magnified scopes but would not limit it to 1-4x or 1-6x as proposed. Since the proposal originated due to the difficulty of finding a 1x optic, it's much easier finding optics that go beyond 4-6x. I work in a large sporting goods store and there are very few optics that would meet the 4-6x requirement. I urge the commission to allow all levels of magnification for the following reasons: 1) many muzzleloaders now come with factory-installed variable power optics; and 2) additional magnification will provide more accurate, lethal shots.

---

**Ed Hiller**

**Arlington SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

muzzle loaders should not be allowed to use rifle scopes during the muzzle loader season. this is supposed to be a primitive hunt.

---

**Howard Smith**

**Pieadmont SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

i am landoner in trip co and mellete county and never have had to send landoner preference guess what i couldnt draw a tag this year with your new system thank you

---

**Maura Lucus**

**Malibu CA**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

Please stop the hunt of mountain lions in South Dakota. Each survivor is irreplaceable and precious.

---

**Russell Frizzell**

**Olympia WA**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

The South Dakota Lion Management Plan should consider that mountain lions are important participants in the circle of life and should be protected.

---

**Blair Voltz**

**Chesterfield VA**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

This draft plan is designed to manage mountain lions for maximum trophy hunting opportunity, not for conservation

Mountain lions regulate their own numbers and do not require intense management to limit their populations.

Hunting is a bad tool, killing the lions least likely to come into conflict with people, pets and livestock, and creating more space for young dispersing lions that are most likely to come into conflict.

Non-lethal methods are more effective and last longer.

Killing female mountain lions results in the orphaning of their kittens. Hunting leaves kittens to die from starvation, dehydration, and exposure.

Mountain lions are a keystone species in their ecosystems, maintaining biological diversity and other benefits to people.

---

**Anna Brewer**

**Phoenix AZ**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

<https://mountainlion.org/ActionAlerts/070119SDMgmtPlan/2019-07-25-SD-Draft-Lion-Plan.pdf>

I read your draft plan and find that unfortunately it is designed to manage mountain lions for maximum trophy hunting opportunity, not for conservation!

Mountain lions regulate their own numbers and do not require intense management to limit their populations. Hunting is a bad tool, killing the lions least likely to come into conflict with people, pets and livestock, and creating more space for young dispersing lions that are most likely to come into conflict. Non-lethal methods are more effective and last longer.

Killing female mountain lions results in the orphaning of their kittens. Hunting leaves kittens to die from starvation, dehydration, and exposure.

Mountain lions are a keystone species in their ecosystems, maintaining biological diversity and other benefits to people.

I urge you to end the hunting of these precious mountain lions.

There's just too little habitat, too much human-caused mortality, and too few mountain lions to justify a hunt.

Remember, South Dakota's wildlife belongs to everyone, not to killers!

---

**Mikki McBride**

**Stockton CA**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Please, for God's sake, don't kill the mountain lions. They are a big part of our ecosystem just as the wolves are. Let them live. They have a right to life just as we humans do. We have moved into their habitats. Not the other way around. Learn to live with them or move out.

---

**Mikki McBride**

**Stockton CA**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Please, for God's sake, don't kill the mountain lions. They are a big part of our ecosystem just as the wolves are. Let them live. They have a right to life just as we humans do. We have moved into their habitats. Not the other way around. Learn to live with them or move out.

---

**Monica Riedler**

**Washington DC**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Please don't kill mountain lions!!!

---

**Irmgard Gutersohn**

**Elpaso TX**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

The SDGFP guesses that there are 111 to 970 mountain lions statewide. What if there are only 111 or 120? Then 60 mountain lions would be half of the population! It could drive them close to extinction! Please, don't issue hunting permits!

---

**Amy Brown**

**Ellendale ND**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Amy Brown, I currently reside in Ellendale North Dakota, but was raised in the Black Hills and consider Rapid City my home town. I am strongly invested in the welfare of the area and it's wildlife.

I am writing in opposition of the Draft Management Plan 2019-2029.

Since 1890, there have been only 25 confirmed fatal cougar attacks on people in all of North America—that's only 25 deaths in about 130 years—according to Dr. Paul Beier, recognized wildlife expert on cougar/human conflicts.

To put these numbers in perspective, you are at far greater risk from being shot by a hunter, killed by lightning, bees, dogs, or cattle. For example, every year about 100 people in the U.S. and Canada are fatally shot by hunters and 20-30 are killed by dogs.

Mountain lions regulate their own numbers and do not require intense management to limit their populations.

Hunting is a bad tool, killing the lions least likely to come into conflict with people, pets and livestock, and creating more space for young dispersing lions that are most likely to come into conflict. Research at the Washington State University Carnivore Conservation Laboratory found that heavy hunting of cougars actually increases conflicts between humans and cougars. These findings run contrary to presumptions of wildlife management programs designed to continually increase kill numbers. Non-lethal methods are more effective and last longer.

Killing female mountain lions results in the orphaning of their kittens. Hunting leaves kittens to die from starvation, dehydration, and exposure. Juvenile lions that haven't developed the skill set needed to hunt prey animals are more likely to target opportunistic prey such as domesticated livestock and pets.

Mountain lions are a keystone species in their ecosystems, maintaining biological diversity for both prey animals and plant species. They are a necessary part of the Black Hills and keeping it the wild and beautiful place that it is.

Thank you for your time,  
Sincerely,  
Amy Brown



---

**Mira Billotte**

**Los Angeles CA**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

This draft plan is designed to manage mountain lions for maximum trophy hunting opportunity, not for conservation.

Mountain lions regulate their own numbers and do not require intense management to limit their populations. Hunting is a bad tool, killing the lions least likely to come into conflict with people, pets and livestock, and creating more space for young dispersing lions that are most likely to come into conflict.

Non-lethal methods are more effective and last longer.

Killing female mountain lions results in the orphaning of their kittens. Hunting leaves kittens to die from starvation, dehydration, and exposure.

Mountain lions are a keystone species in their ecosystems, maintaining biological diversity and other benefits to people.

Please revoke the hunting licenses for Mountain Lions, they are a very small population.

Thank you for reading.

Mira Billotte

Los Angeles, CA 90026

---

**Heather Feeley**

**Media PA**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Hello. I am kind writing in regards to the hunting of mountain lions. Please take into consideration that Mountain lions regulate their own numbers and do not require intense management to limit their populations.

Hunting is a bad tool, killing the lions least likely to come into conflict with people, pets and livestock, and creating more space for young dispersing lions that are most likely to come into conflict.

Killing female mountain lions results in the orphaning of their kittens. Hunting leaves kittens to die from starvation, dehydration, and exposure. At the very least Non-lethal methods are more effective and last longer.

With such a small population we ask that you please ban any hunting in the near future. Thank you.

---

**Staci Downey**

**Overland Park KS**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I oppose any kind of Mt Lion hunt! Their numbers are way to low to justify killing any of these beautiful and necessary cats. We visit S Dakota for the wildlife like so many people and all wildlife needs to be protected. They belong there and regulate their own populations!

---

**Adam Martin**

**Boulder CO**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I appose the mountain lion hunt and would like to see little to no quota in order to save their population

---

**Shauna Stannard**

**Boulder CO**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I oppose hunting of mountain lions.

---

**Wendy Roth**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

This draft plan is designed to manage mountain lions for maximum trophy hunting opportunity, not for conservation.

Mountain lions regulate their own numbers and do not require intense management to limit their populations.

Hunting is a bad tool, killing the lions least likely to come into conflict with people, pets and livestock, and creating more space for young dispersing lions that are most likely to come into conflict.

Non-lethal methods are more effective and last longer.

Killing female mountain lions results in the orphaning of their kittens. Hunting leaves kittens to die from starvation, dehydration, and exposure.

Mountain lions are a keystone species in their ecosystems, maintaining biological diversity and other benefits to people.

---

**Cindy Letchworth**

**St Louis MO**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Please stop the killing of mountain lions. These animals are vital to the ecosystem. By killing up to 60 individuals you are making it impossible for genetic continuance. Don't we have more serious problems than killing all the mountain lions? Please stop this unnecessary killing.

---

**Luke Dummeldinger**

**West Chester PA**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Please end mountain lion hunting in South Dakota

---

**Christy Bolle**

**Monrovia CA**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

It is extremely important to save, protect& support mountain lions, they are amazing, majestic creatures that deserve to be here!! They are just trying to survive like us!! They have Gorton a bad reputation by IGNORANT people!! We're the only ones destroying the planet & wiping out other species!!! Help help save & support mountain lions NOT KILL them!!!

---

**Kristen Hart**

**Portland OR**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I am writing in opposition to the proposed Lion Management Plan on account of the following:

This draft plan is designed to manage mountain lions for maximum trophy hunting opportunity, not for conservation.

Mountain lions regulate their own numbers and do not require intense management to limit their populations.

Hunting is a bad tool, killing the lions least likely to come into conflict with people, pets and livestock, and creating more space for young dispersing lions that are most likely to come into conflict.

Non-lethal methods are more effective and last longer.

Killing female mountain lions results in the orphaning of their kittens. Hunting leaves kittens to die from starvation, dehydration, and exposure.

Mountain lions are a keystone species in their ecosystems, maintaining biological diversity and other benefits to people.

Sincerely,  
Kristen Hart

---

**Darral Beshara**

**Sturgis SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Deerfield lake is one of the most beautiful and tranquil lakes in the black hills. Let's keep it that way. No! Don't remove the no wake rule.

---

**Darral Beshara**

**Sturgis SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Deerfield lake is one of the most beautiful and tranquil lakes in the black hills. Let's keep it that way. No! Don't remove the no wake rule.

---

**Jason Taylor**

**Fort Pierre SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Muzzleloader Scope Proposal

I am against allowing scopes above 1x power on muzzleloaders. There are hunters out there that don't put in for muzzleloader because they currently have to use open sights or a 1x power scope, changing that regulation and opening it up, will make the hunt easier and will make the tag even harder to draw because more people will start to apply for the muzzleloader tag. There are some hunters that push their limits with rifles and try to take shots that are too far or beyond their capability, just because there is a buck standing on the hill side. Allowing a scope beyond 1x power would give some hunters a false sense of comfort and they will try to take shots beyond the muzzleloaders effective range or beyond the distance that the hunter has practiced at, at the range. In turn it could wound more deer. Yes 1x scope is not a popular one, but companies do make them. I did some looking and have found 4 different brands of 1x power muzzleloader scopes for under \$200 on the internet. Leave the scopes off muzzleloaders and keep it as primitive as possible, that is what makes this tag, a fun and memorable experience.

## Rules Review Process

---

**Doug Hunhoff**

**Smithville MO**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I was born and raised in Yankton SD, but due to life move to Missouri. But I have been coming back to hunt big game and small game forever. And most of that was Archery deer and antelope combo hunts. So thanks for screwing that up by making October 1st opening day for non residents on public land. Would have to say this current commission have no clue what they are doing.

---

**Cody Warren**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Hello Commissioners, I would like to Voice my opposition to the petition of increasing muzzleloader optics to more than 1X . The technology of muzzleloaders these days with a more powerful scope you might as well just make it another rifle tag. Muzzleloader license was made for primitive hunting and I oppose any sort of magnification sights. There is already a high demand for this license with increasing the magnification the demand will increase as well. I say leave the rule alone and people who want this tag should adjust their skills to make it a successful hunt. Thank you for your time

---

**David Frankenbery**

**Custer SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

ALLOWING 1-4X SCOPES: I support the use of scopes up to 4x for the muzzleloading season. This will reduce the chances of less experienced hunters from wounding an animal. I would also like to see an additional short muzzleloading season just prior to the regular firearms season to allow those who hunt with a more primitive weapon a better chance of hunting deer before the modern rifle hunters kill them off. Pennsylvania has a split muzzleloading season which is a 7 day early season and a 30 day late season, before and after the regular rifle deer season. This works out best and is more fair.

---

**Mark Miller**

**Black Hawk SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I am in favor of the 1 to 6 power scope for muzzle loaders the season is late and I am getting older and my eyes do not like open sights any more

---

## Trapping Prohibitions (Trap Check Times)

---

**Kristina Luce**

**Artesian SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

support

---

**Brittney Davis-Schacht**

**Artesian SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

support

---

**Alexandria Triplett**

**Artesian SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

support

---

**Leon Luce**

**Artesian SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I believe traps should be checked every day, for one reason if someone's pet or livestock do get caught in a leg hold trap it can be released especially with the rules of trapping in the public right of way which is another topic. And also if people can't check their traps because they have to many they shouldn't run that many. I was always taught to run trap lines every day not only for the suffering of the prey but the damage to the hide since that is the main reason people trap is for the income. Thanks Leon J Luce

---

**Dylan Beckman**

**Prairie City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Ashley Neuharth**

**Menno SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose this petition! Thank you!

---

**Denise Hickam**

**Timber Lake SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

As a woman trapper with my husband, I oppose shortening trap times, we had about 100 traps and snares and although we tried very hard to check every day some days we were unable to do so, do to weather mostly but other factors did come into play. During heavy snow drifts even with a UTV, it sometimes took a couple days to complete checks.

---

**Philip Neuharth**

**Menno SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Please do not let anti trapping groups like this undermine our trapping traditions in South Dakota. It is obvious Nancy is not a trapper and their only intention is to slowly chip away at trapping here in this great state.

The check laws are written the way they are for reasons. Let me share an example of why this 24 hour check is not good.

If my 9 year old daughter and myself set a trap at 3 PM Sunday afternoon, then on Monday when my daughter gets out of school at 330 we proceed to go check her trap, now she is a criminal. Makes no sense at all.

Thank you for protecting our trapping heritage here in South Dakota, and not letting the anti's undermine our laws.

#secondcenturytrapper

---

**Linda Neuharth**

**Menno SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I oppose

---

**Nathan Torberson**

**Freeman SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Please do not change the trapping regulations per the letter that was submitted.

\*trapping check times

\*identifying traps

\*listing of properties to be trapped

\*mandatory survey of non-target animals caught

\*allowing bystanders to euthanize animals found in traps

..etc..

The rules are fine as is.

Thank you.

---

**Tyler Kari**

**Bison SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

This measure is not reasonable nor practical. Furthermore, I implore both Nancy Hilding and select members of the commission to stop trying to impose further restrictions on South Dakota trappers.

---

**Allan Minear**

**Lewistown MT**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Roy Dahlgren**

**Bark River MI**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I state hope trapping I've trapped north Dakota an south an there is know way a person can check all traps in 24 hours

---

**Angela Billings**

**Oakland MS**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

The trap check law is poorly written and will be very hard to adhere to, as written.



---

**Don Brandner**  
**Lake Preston SD**  
**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**  
oppose

---

**Steve Johnson**  
**Pierre SD**  
**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**  
oppose

---

**Joe Tropea**  
**Bridgeport NJ**  
**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**  
Not fair for the trappers and their familys

---

**Larry Baer**  
**West Peoria IL**  
**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**  
I like South Dakota and vacation there and spend money there on trapping supplies. Thanks, Larry

---

**Mark Monti**  
**Berthold ND**  
**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**  
oppose

---

**Sean Davis**

**Forsyth MT**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Anti trapping groups do not present scientific or logical reasons. Their reasons are based upon emotion. South Dakota has a lot to lose if they start going down this path. This year it is trapping, next year will be game bird hunting or fishing regulations they want to change.

---

**Larry Murphy**

**Merit TX**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Leave the Trapping Regulations alone. No need for change unless to amend the part where Non-Residents can't trap. I have been a professional trapper for 40+ years.

---

**Jeremy Laakso**

**Champion MI**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Paul Zieroth**

**Saginaw MN**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Kathy Monti**

**Berthold ND**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**James Selgeby**

**Reville SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

The regulations as currently written adequately protect the interests of all South Dakotans along with the wildlife resources. The proposed changes are only for the purpose of restricting or harassing trappers.

---

**Clifford Fowler**

**Mexico MO**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Eugene Drinkman**

**Gordon WI**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Harold Dorsett**

**Efland NC**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Unnecessary complications and ambiguous regulations

---

**Michael Lippold**

**Maysville MO**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Merris Miller**

**Lennox SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Adrian Laurendeau**

**Mitchell SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

The current laws in place WORK and have for years. There is no need to change them and complicate things.

---

**Daniel Engebretson**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Kevin Firari**

**Juneau WI**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Scott Willman**

**Three Lakes WI**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Dan Turbak**

**Reville SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Anti hunters and anti trappers are constantly trying to make it harder for people that enjoy the outdoors to do so. I would like to see hunting, trapping, and fishing rights added to the state constitution so that these outdoor activities dont get regulated to death.

---

**Colt Abel**

**Waubay SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Jerry Herbst**

**Pukwana SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

You want to reduce varmints and now you want to make it harder with useless rules that take the efficiency out of the process. Time to get them anti-trapping idiots off of the commission. Last year it was snares on all public lands (may places where pheasants did not even live) with the bird numbers hurting the "plan" was to reduce predator control and not shorten the bird season by 1 day.

---

**James Cox**

**Brady MT**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Kyle Couchey**

**Mina SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Please do not change our trapping regulations. They are fine the way they are with no scientific reason, or recorded public safety reason to change.

---

**Kevin Nordby**

**Laurel NE**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Dale Simpson**

**Saint Lawrence SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I trap coyotes each fall and have for years. A 24 check will eliminate that. They are to much creatures of habit for a 24 hour check. Please do not do this, I enjoy it and will have to stop.

Dale Simpson  
St Lawrence, SD 57373

---

**Eric Wieland**

**Lemmon ID**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

As a SD sportsmen I am opposed to any changes in the current trapping regulations.

---

**Kevin Stake**

**Baileyville IL**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Dale Halling**

**Bryant SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Kyle Krebs**

**Gladstone ND**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Brian Gundvaldson**

**Egan SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**James Barnett**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I agree that checking traps holding wild/live animals is very important to ensure humane treatment. I might humbly suggest that an exception be made on the the amount of time if utilizing the killer or connibear traps as the animal is quickly dispatched by the trap itself. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Bert Whitley**

**Lexington IN**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Jacob Whitley**

**Lexington IN**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Jim Firmin**

**Fairbanks AK**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Dusty Luedtke**

**Houston MN**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Dusty Luedtke**

**Houston MN**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Dusty Luedtke**

**Houston MN**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Jerry Orloski**

**Mountain Top PA**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose



---

**Bob` Simpson**

**Huron SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

This is not practical in SD. Ask your state trappers if they can operate under such restrictions. I have trapped for 40 years and our check law is not broken - do not change it. This would put an end to many of us trapping in a time when pheasant numbers are already declining. Thank you

---

**Wayne Opatz**

**Soixfalls SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Don't need the new laws. Existing laws aren't abused. Enough laws on the books

---

**Kevin Thibodeau**

**Onida SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Paul Kuhlman**

**Avon SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I strongly urge you to oppose all measures in this petition. Current trapping regulations are working excellent for our state. These efforts are the beginning of small steps to limit the opportunities of our citizens to participate in the great outdoors that are available in our great state. Please do not let measures like this petition succeed or we will be well on our way to become like states such as California, that are destroying our great heritage of trapping.

---

**Gary Myers. Sr**

**Klamath Falls OR**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Ryan Jurgess**

**Brown City MI**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Jon Betten**

**Redfield SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

If anything allow east river a 3 day check also....

---

**Jon Betten**

**Redfield SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

If anything allow east river a 3 day check also....

---

**Dan Christiansen**

**Hartford SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Melvin Utter**

**Bison SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Brandon Penzkover**

**La Crosse WI**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Zac Thompson**

**Lemmon SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

This would negatively impact the predator control program across the state, and make it cost prohibitive for trappers.

---

**Jake Middlebrooks**

**Elizabeth AR**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I oppose changing trap check times in south Dakota. The current trap check times are sufficient and allow fur harvesters to run a more effect trap line for coyote and predator control.

---

**Eric Kindsfater**

**Enola AR**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

My family has owned farm land outside of Belle Fourche for multiple generations. We raise beef and sheep. We've also leased other farms and ranches over the years both east and north of Belle Fourche. I oppose the proposed rule changes to the existing language of SDGFP Regulation 41:08:02:03. I trapped in SD for many years for predator and nest predator control, and have even purchased NR trapping license as recently as a couple years ago. Changing the trap check laws to every 24 hours and adding administrative 'clerical' duties of weather record keeping are onerous and unnecessary. Should this rule change be allowed, trappers will be be much less likely to take predators as efficiently and effectively as they can currently. This proposed change is not in-keeping with the significant resources SD has invested in decreasing nest predator populations. Why would SDGFP move backwards and hamstring trappers with inefficient trap check times? Which special interest group is proposing this?

---

**Dennis Wendel**

**Bryant IN**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Danielle Rhine**

**Philip SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Haren Mobly**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Instead of reducing the trapcheck time, GFP should consider extending it! Please do not cave to the anti-hunters, South Dakota sportsmen and women deserve better. Once again, please reject this proposal.

---

**Justin Rhine**

**Lander WY**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Edward Schneider**

**Burlingame KS**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

As a out of state trapper, I have experienced times where predator populations are very low. During these times having a lower check requirement can be costly in the terms of gasoline and cause shy predators to become more wary.

Predator population control is best served by the trapper using good management practices. It is not in the trappers interest to have predators waiting for days in a trap. However, Populations dictate how often it is feasible. I myself prefer a 72 hour check when we experience a low population. During periods of many animals, I will voluntarily check my sets much quicker. Daily checks have a major impact on predator catch rate. These animals do not like human pressure and will move temporarily resulting in lower success by the trapper and more need in government paid trappers and gunners where the animal is left dead. I feel this is poor use of a animal's life.

I sincerely hope this comment helps.

I truly enjoy my time in your state each year.

Sincerely,

Ed Schneider

---

**Tara Darby**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Todd Chamley**

**Trent SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

These anti trapping, hunting, fishing groups are always looking to take away privileges that we sportsman have. They will never stop their assault on our rights, because we have shown in the past that if they complain enough we give in to their wishes. How has that worked out so far for us? Not well I'd say, because next session their is always another "cause" they are pushing for. The only thing they want is NO HARVESTING of our natural resources, that is their end game. Doubt that, just look to the west and their more "progressive" states, give them an inch and they will be back for a mile! Our state is full of wonderful sportsmen and women, why are we always looking to penalize or change things that have worked successfully for decades?

---

**Jeff Beemer**

**Searsport ME**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I support sound wildlife management practices in every state. Such efforts are achieved through reasonable, well-thought-out policies that do not obstruct or diminish needlessly the legal activities of trappers and hunters whose work is vital to managing wildlife throughout the United States. Nancy Hilding's proposals would frustrate and reduce South Dakota's wildlife management effectiveness through administrative excess and inefficiencies. Ms. Hilding's proposals would have no direct – positive – impact on wildlife populations, and only increase bureaucratic/legal burdens at the expense of healthy game and non-game populations. The petition that Ms. Hilding has proposed is not a set of measures designed to advance sound wildlife management and should be rejected. Thank you.

---

**Steven Teske**

**Fort Dodge IA**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Billy Perry**

**Manistique MI**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Jake Stall**

**Elkhart IA**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I lived in South Dakota for a number of years and trapped while I lived there. Due to the distances involved the current check time requirements helped a lot, especially if I had unexpected problems arise in other areas of my life there as was common with work and school.

---

**Mark Steck**

**Lennox SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Dear Commissioners,

Once again trappers are under siege by the small but persistent Antitrapping group here in South Dakota. The goal and strategy for many years, by anti-groups across the county is to chip away at rules and statutes until it is nearly impossible for us to trap and hunt. They have succeeded in a handful of states. It's an incremental approach.

I do coyote control for west river ranchers during the fall and winter. I also trap their skunks, porcupines, and raccoons. I make wages without charging them a dime. Reducing my check times would greatly increase my cost per animal. Hence, I would need to charge for my services or not trap their land.

This is the second assault upon trapping in the last 2-3 years. I feel like I'm living on the west coast. Incidentally when foothold trapping I use traps that are quite foot friendly. Never once have I had a coyote or other animal expire in my traps. I can choose to kill the animal almost instantly or keep them alive and healthy until I dispatch them myself. When snaring my critters are dead within minutes.

Mark Steck  
Lennox, SD

---

**Darren Nutt**

**Curtis NE**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Chris Flann**

**Pingree ND**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

This whole petition is a waste of time. Every one of the measures suggested are simply a way of making a practice that the petitioners dislike harder for the average person to do. They have no practical use in wildlife management and the harvest of furbearers. SDGFP is doing a wonderful job of managing resources and the trapping community is doing a wonderful job of practicing responsible stewardship. This is simply a move to slowly abolish trapping.

---

**John Roscoe**

**Brookings SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Katie Buss**

**Mitchell SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

These laws need to remain unchanged. They have worked for years and will continue to work!!

---

**Scott Nibe**

**Story City IA**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Cody Grewing**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Mark Smedsrud**

**Hartford SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I am firmly opposed to changing the trap check times from what they currently are. I am a retired Conservation Officer supervisor and have trapped for over 40 years. The rules we have in place now are fair, workable and humane. A 24 hour check law will eliminate many trappers from trapping in South Dakota. Most trappers trap around a work schedule or school schedule or both. I may check my traps at 8 AM on Saturday but not until 12 PM or later on a subsequent day. I would be illegal. Sometimes inclement weather dictates when I check my traps and a short check time is not reasonable. I know from my work history that the Audubon Society is anti-trapping (and anti hunting) and their ultimate goal is to outlaw trapping. Enacting burdensome, unworkable regulations will help them achieve their goal. No consumptive use of wildlife is perfect. Hunters cripple deer and game birds with firearms and archery equipment. Fishermen release fish that eventually die due to hooking mortality. Trapping plays a valuable role in managing furbearers and predators. The trap check rules that are currently in place are reasonable and balance animal welfare and the trappers ability to participate in the sport. It has been working well for many years. Thank you, Mark Smedsrud.

---

**Travis Hymans**

**Lake Norden SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

A 24 hr check makes the person have to check earlier and earlier every day to stay inside the law . If you leave at the same time and have to stop . The rest of the trapline will be over the 24 hr check

---

**Douglas Sullivan**

**Portland ME**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Donald Stiffler**

**Stahlstown PA**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose



---

**Ensel Metz**

**Fort Wayne IN**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

other

---

**Steve Wickman**

**Hillsdale WI**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Scott Young**

**Mankato KS**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Greg Reininga**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Michael Hanson**

**Shoreham VT**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

These regulations are completely unneeded and will cause outdoorsmen to not move to your state or spend their travel money there.

---

**Scott Person**

**Monroe SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Mitch Johnson**

**Crofton NE**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

As a trapper in a bordering state, I hate to see trapping in SD restricted more. While I am not opposed to the trap tag portion, the other portions would hinder trappers in several ways. Trapping is under fire in many states. I hate to see SD being one of them.

---

**Dusty Luedtke**

**Houston MN**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Richard Johnson**

**Greene IA**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Justin Bartling**

**Gregory SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I want to start off by saying I am concerned with SDGFP considering this as an option in our state. This proposal was brought forward by a known ANTI TRAPPING/HUNTING organization and they should have no part in making laws for sportsman to follow.

I myself work full time year round and trap year round for pheasant, deer and cattle operations in the spring and summer and then trap all winter for fur as well. It takes me 9 hours to run my 156 mile long line. I will be unable to trap if you go forward with a 24hour or even 48hour trap check law. It will effectively end trapping for any serious Trappers in South Dakota and that is the over all goal of this proposal.

---

**Travis Sargent**

**Burke SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

A 24/hr check limit is not reasonable or feasible in our terrain and areas. The current system works perfectly fine and we do not need added restrictions

---

**Scott Mcelravy**

**South Paris ME**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

It would be wise to allow the fish and game professionals manage the wildlife. The suggested rule changes are simply a political position by those that make money attempting to stop hunting, fishing and trapping.

---

**George Barger**

**Urbana OH**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Ethan Cassidy**

**Fostoria OH**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**James Rezac**

**Lennox SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

The author of this letter has no idea what trapping is about or why we do it. Allowing people to tamper with a trappers property and animals in them is a totally irresponsible idea and you know it cannot be allowed . Jim Rezac

---

**James Rezac**

**Lennox SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

The author of this letter has no idea what trapping is about or why we do it. Allowing people to tamper with a trappers property and animals in them is a totally irresponsible idea and you know it cannot be allowed . Jim Rezac

---

**Lance Wilke**

**Mellette SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Lance Wilke**

**Mellette SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**April Solheim**

**Mellette SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Alicyn Sandquist**

**Mellette SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Cole Sandquist**

**Mellette SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Clay Solheim**

**Mellette SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Traci Harford**

**Redfield SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Savannah Harford**

**Redfield SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Ralph Jeschke**

**Mellette SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**James Halverson**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

1. The current trapping guidelines in place have been effective, efficient, and a workable compromise between various parties and groups since they were put in place.

2. The proposed changes are not effective, or efficient and place undo burden on both trappers and agency personnel who would be responsible for the additional requirements proposed by this petition.

The South Dakota Stockgrowers and the SDSGA Wildlife Management committee oppose this petition.

---

**Dan Krogman**

**White River SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

As a rancher in mellette county with a 24 hour check I could hardly get traps checked on my own ground, let alone the other ranches I trap free of charge. Coyotes in ranching country need controlled. Thousands of dollars are spent in that endeavor. A 24 hour check would cut my ability to keep coyotes in check by 2/3rds This is not a good idea and all tax paying ranchers would feel the same

---

**John Couchey**

**Ipswich SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Please do not change the rules. There is no problem that needs to be fixed. Trap check times are suffice and humane the way they are.

---

**Jason Vollmer**

**Montrose SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Trapping rules need to be relaxed not more restrictive.

For too long trappers have lost privileges too anti wildlife management people.

---

**Dean Bartz**

**Kesley IA**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Nadine Wilke**

**Ringoes NJ**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Joseph Wilke**

**Ringoes NJ**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Joseph Wilke**

**Trenton NJ**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Michael Evans**

**Jacksonville IL**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Reducing trap check times to 24 hours from 48 would reduce the effectiveness of trapping as the excellent wildlife management tool that it is.

---

**Tom Miranda**

**Englewood FL**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Due to the huge size of the state and lack of private trappers -due to fur value- current trap check laws should remain the same. Thank You

---

**Sean Eaton**

**Mellette SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

In an area like this where we provide for our family by means of Trapping we vehemently oppose any changes under the new laws suggested.

---

**Lisa Dandria**

**Flemington NJ**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Lisa Dandria**

**Flemington NJ**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**David Kendall**

**Flemington NJ**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose



---

**Nicole Dandria**  
**Flemington NJ**  
**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**  
oppose

---

**Kevin Anderson**  
**Wisc. Rapids WI**  
**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**  
oppose

---

**Riley Nichols**  
**Redfield SD**  
**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**  
oppose

---

**Jack Kirkebak**  
**Alcester SD**  
**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**  
Trapping is necessary,a two day check is not to long

---

**Trenton Sonsalla**  
**Lemmon SD**  
**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**  
Please leave it the way it is currently.

---

**Spencer Lynch**  
**St. James MO**  
**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**  
oppose

---

**Brad Roghair**

**Okaton SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Michael Webb**

**Eldorado AR**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Tom Miklos**

**Custer SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Amy Miklos**

**Custer SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

If people think it's cruel to leave animals in a traps for over 24 hours they should witness a coyote eating a newborn calf alive!

---

**Rachel Miklos**

**Custer SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

With school and sports schedules we don't always have time to check traps every day

---

**Remington Miklos**

**Custer SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I don't always have time to check traps after school every day

---

**Suzanne Weber**

**Edgemont SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Susan Braunstein**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Please change the law so traps are checked every 24 hours. It is the humane thing to do. Thank you.

---

**Charlotte Petrick**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Thank you. Dying of dehydration, languishing in a trap, is beyond cruel & inhumane. I've hunted for over 50 years and always take shots that I know will end in a quick death. South Dakota needs these new laws!

---

**Peggy Mann**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I support of SDGFP's proposal because requiring traps to be checked at least once every 24 hours will reduce animal suffering and protect unintended victims. Ultimately I would like trapping banned.

---

**Theresa Giannavola**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I would prefer you ban trapping COMPLETELY like many other states as it is cruel and barbaric but since that is not a consideration at this time I would ask that you change the trap check time to 24-hours, with no exceptions. Two to three days is FAR too long for an animal to suffer in a trap!

---

**Peggy Mann**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I support of SDGFP's proposal because requiring traps to be checked at least once every 24 hours will reduce animal suffering and protect unintended victims. Ultimately I would like trapping banned.

---

**Dianna Torson**

**Brookings SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Ethical trappers check their traps every day!!!  
This needless suffering by our indigenous animals needs to stop. Thank you.

---

**Paulette Kirby**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

Support 24 hour mandatory check of traps.

---

**Julie Berry**

**Vermillion SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I think it appalling that we even allow trapping, but it is horrifying that they are not required to be checked daily. And I feel there should be NO exceptions for weather or illness

---

**Shana Huls**

**Lennox SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Traps are cruel, and especially cruel if left unchecked. Domestic animals have also been caught in our area.

---

**Kerma Cox**

**Custer SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Although I wish traps were illegal, at the very least people should be required to check their traps at least every 24 hours. These types of traps are very cruel and create much unnecessary suffering, along with the aspect of catching unintended animals. (Think dog, cat, endangered, protected animals).

---

**Kim Ferrel**

**Black Hawk SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Trapping is inhumane. The least we can do is check them at least every 24 hours.

---

**Courtney Huse Wika**

**Spearfish SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Jeannette Thomas Vance**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Janet Sargent**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Please! There should be a requirement to check traps at Least every 24hrs.

---

**Dee Anne Krebs**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Vicki Peterson**

**Watertown SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Any time in a trap is too long. They need to be checked EVERY DAY. I am against trapping as it is but don't let the animals suffer longer than necessary. My sisters cat was in one.

---

**Rachael Gilbertson**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Any responsible hunter knows it is best to have a clean and quick kill with as little waste as possible. How is letting an animal suffer for 3 days (if the correct animal is even trapped) responsible? There was not enough research conducted on this initiative nor are sufficient checks and balances in place.

---

**Lisa Moore**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Since we are a humane society we can surely show that same humanity to living creatures and not allow them to suffer needlessly simply because "there isn't time to check the trap". If that's the case then don't trap at all. Check the traps every 24hours as what true outdoorsman do.

---

**Teena O'toole**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I think 24 hours is the maximum length a trap should be unattended. I also disagree with open hunting during the spring for small critters when they're having their offspring!

---

**Cecilia Banner**

**Longmont CO**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

It is an immorality that these traps are still used at all. Because trappers and others do not concede that animals are sentient, does not make it any less so. Appeals to those with the authority to decide will not likely be accepting of what they will consider an emotional request, nonetheless the suffering of animals is a legitimate basis to consider seriously. This cruelty is on you.

---

**Tara Beady**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

Our state can do better. If you are going to push trapping do it in the most humane way possible. 24 hours is still too much time for these innocent animals to suffer but it's far better than 2 or 3 days. Please institute the 24 hr rule or stop pushing trapping all together.

---

**Melinda Bergeron**

**Greenbush MN**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Anne Fuehrer**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Tammy Jungen**

**Watertown SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

It's inhumane to not have the traps checked daily. Please require the 24 hour trap check.

---

**Molly O'connor**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

This is a no-brainer. Only a monster would support trapping these animals for over 24 hours unchecked. For the love of God, have some humanity.

---

**Ginny Dejager**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Trapping these animals is one of the most stupid things I have ever heard of. That being said I do think the traps need to be checked every 24 hours and actually done away with. What are we teaching our kids, earn money by killing animals that are good. Just plain stupid.

---

**Margaret Sohn**

**Gainesville FL**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

All traps obviously should be checked at least once a day.

---

**Laural Bidwell**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

While I realize that there is no way to enforce this since there are already not enough GFP staff to enforce any of the trapping rules, I do believe we have a responsibility to hunt and trap as humanely as possible. Leaving any animal in a trap for 2-3 days is inhumane and lazy. If the traps can't be checked daily the individual has put out too many traps. What if the animal caught is not on the list of acceptable catch and kills? Like someone's cat or dog? There should be a chance for them to survive being trapped. But the main argument for me is humane. These are not unfeeling entities - they are living breathing animals with brains that are being starved, dehydrated and terrified for 3 days. That is too long.



---

**Suzanne Hodges**

**Sacramento CA**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Chris Krohmer**

**Mitchell SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Oh please, require the checking of traps every 24 hours. Do allow it to go any longer is such a terrible mistreatment of animal and causes needless suffering.

---

**Sharon Rose**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I don't support leaving animals in traps to suffer for several days. That's incredibly inhumane.

---

**Emily Norman**

**Ft. Pierre SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Val Dziwulski**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Trapping is already cruel and inhumane. Dehydration, fear, chewing their own limbs to get free, being attacked. No living being should have to endure that kind of pain, fear and cruelty. This horrific method also endangers other wildlife and pets. Death should be quick and humane always.

---

**Maggie Melanson**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Stephanie Samavarchian**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Traps need to be checked every 24 hours to avoid needless suffering and mistakes such as domestic animals being trapped.

---

**Louise Mcgannon**

**Mitchell SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I support no trapping, it is cruel! Very cruel, but if I am not able to persuade you to no trapping the least you can do is to make people check them every 24 hours. But my question is how do you make people do anything. You can have a law, but it is very hard to enforce it.

No animal deserves to be caught in a live trap or one of the other kind. They are living their lives as nature intended and man decides they shouldn't get to.

---

**Daniel Turbak**

**Reville SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I would like to see the laws left alone. Anti groups are clearly trying to make it difficult for people to trap and stay within the laws. Weather is unpredictable and would result in trappers not being able to meet the 24 hour check requirement. When anti groups get rid of trapping they will come after hunting. We should be pushing to get hunting and trapping into the state constitution instead of trying to take away these lifestyles.

---

**David Skeide**

**Webster SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

We have had no problem with the current regulations in the past and we should leave them alone . Thank you  
Dave S. Webster sad.

---

**Jennifer Mcfarland**

**Apache Junction AZ**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Tracie Allen**

**Texarkana SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Traps are inhuman, period. Live traps included. I cannot believe we are still in the dark ages in the atrocious care of any living animal. Many times they are not checked for 2 to 3 days, OR MORE, causing the animal to starve, no water, in the open to all nature's elements, dying a horrible death more times than not. And what of their babies, starving, or eaten by other prey without their mothers. WOW, really humans still do this? How would you like to be put in the same situation. Honestly, would you, NO. These animals feel and hurt just as we do, please think about that. THEY HURT TO!!!! Please have some passion and stop this, PLEASE STOP.

---

**Caleb Ranschau**

**Canton SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I am against changing the regulations on changing trap check times. It seems like South Dakota is being drown with anti trap rules.

---

**Gwyneth Fastnacht**

**Wessington Springs SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Please require 24-hour trap checks to limit and prevent needless suffering for trapped animals. If our society is going to contour this trapping practice, we must at least step-up to be responsible to the animals and respectful of their lives. We must make the trap-check requirements more stringent and require much for frequent checks than currently required. I am in FAVOR of this proposal.

---

**Letha Lewandowski**

**Webster SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I believe the shortened time of 24 hours that a trapper would have in between checking traps is a good idea. It makes trapping slightly more humane.

---

**Jeanette Williams**

**Vermillion SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I realize you have no intention of listening to the public on this, but here's my view. I oppose trapping altogether, but if you are going to allow trapping the traps need to be checked every 24 hours.

---

**Clarence G. Lems**

**Canton SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I'm a life long South Dakota resident. I grew up on a sheep farm in SE South Dakota. I am a land owner/farmer/land manager, and I trap 3-4 months out of the year, once the crop is out. I've been trapping since I was 10 years old. Like farmers know how to take care of their livestock, Trappers know how to take care of the animals they catch and they manage their traplines based on the time they have and the weather conditions that exist. The Trappers in South Dakota have been working along side farmers and ranchers as well as the State damage control personnel for years under the current check laws. I don't see that there has been a problem. I'm disappointed that an Anti-trapping group with ties from outside our state have been given a platform for their agenda within our game commission. Thankfully, both at the National level and the state level there is a real effort to cut regulations, not develop new ones. I'm glad to see our Governor trying new approaches to promote trapping within our state. Trapping is a necessary tool to help control our predator species throughout our state while maintaining a healthy game population for all sportsman and wildlife enthusiasts that come to our state. If this new rule we're enacted it would be a setback for everyone involved in managing the wildlife in South Dakota. Leave it alone. Thanks for the opportunity to respond.

---

**Chad Mahler**

**Sutherland IA**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I am opposed to the constant chipping away at our trapping rights!

---

**Cristin Holm**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I do not in the slightest support this bounty program, I think it is totally cruel and inhumane and I definitely don't agree with only the traps every 3 days.

---

**Justin Krajewski**

**Spearfish SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Thank you for accepting my comments on the proposed trap check regulation. I am opposed to this proposal because it is unnecessary. This proposal would force almost all coyote trappers, including myself, to stop trapping and harvesting furbearers on our traplines. And that is exactly what the proposer and BornFreeUSA wish to do...is to ban all trapping and hunting as that group and others have pushed for in other states. Also I am disappointed that Audubon would pursue placing undue regulations on trappers since our work in harvesting predators help several species of birds throughout the state and region. Our neighboring states have similar trap check rules to South Dakota except Minnesota and Nebraska, which have varied check times depending on the specific species. Again, I oppose this proposal and appreciate the opportunity to comment to the SDGFP Commission.

---

**Dianna Torson**

**Brookings SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Any ethical trapper would check the traps every day. I hate trapping. Have had pets trapped. But if it has to be then traps must be checked every day. Leaving animals to starve is inhumane.

---

**Kris Hoffman**

**Lennox SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Jerry Wilson**

**Vermillion SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

As a young teenager, I trapped a few fur-bearing animals (what the governor likes to call "nest predators.") It didn't take me long to decide on my own that this was not acceptable behavior for me.

My father, who had also trapped as a boy, made it completely clear that ethics were involved. If I were going to trap, I had to check traps every morning before school, regardless of the weather.

I am deeply disturbed by the disrespect for native wildlife exhibited by the governor, and apparently by some in the GFP leadership. If the imported pheasant is important to the economy, then we need to stop farming from ditch to ditch, require filter strips, and restore habitat.

Teaching young people that killing native wildlife is "family fun" is wrong. The least we can do is to require basic ethical behavior by those who trap.

Jerry Wilson

---

**Lance Catron**

**Custer SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I oppose the 24 hour requirement for trap checking. I believe that it is unreasonable for a trap to be set at 8 AM and checked by 8 AM the next day for the common hobby recreational trapper with a family. Also with the advancement of offset trap jaws, multiple swivels and shock springs there is no damage to the critter by the trap. I believe the current trap check rules are sufficient and should not be changed. Respectfully submitted.

---

**Brian Watland**

**Custer SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

The current trap check laws do not need to be changed. Most trappers are true sportsmen who do not want an animal to suffer. They often design their trap sets to humanly dispatch the animal quickly. South Dakota is geographically a very large state, and additional time may be needed to run a trap line. If possible, most trappers check their traps more frequently than the time limits set by the current law. Please do not change the current trap check regulations.

---

**Brian Watland**

**Custer SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

The current trap check laws do not need to be changed. Most trappers are true sportsmen who do not want an animal to suffer. They often design their trap sets to humanly dispatch the animal quickly. South Dakota is geographically a very large state, and additional time may be needed to run a trap line. If possible, most trappers check their traps more frequently than the time limits set by the current law. Please do not change the current trap check regulations.

---

**Andrea Sreiber**

**Schenectady NY**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

Dear IRRC legislator:

With this message I urge you to please reject the SDGFP Commission's rule change proposal to extend the use of "live traps" on public lands and right-of-ways!

Trapping is currently Not allowed on public lands during the summer months so tourists have an opportunity to enjoy the land without the fear of encountering traps, for themselves, their children and their pets!

Please do not change this!

A few other reasons to reject the proposed change of rule:

- Mothers caught in live traps are kept from feeding dependent young - trappers are not just killing the mom, but also the litters of orphaned young they left at their nest to starve!

- Traps are only required to be checked every 3 days west of the Missouri River and every 2 days east of the Missouri River. Trapped animals suffer from pain, dehydration, starvation and exposure to the elements....

- SD has very lax trap check time regulations, non-target animals are being caught, languish in traps and can suffer a cruel death. Non-target animals include wildlife and domestic animals, like birds, protected species, cats, dogs, and other animals.

Please let's remain humane, and sharpen the law instead of extending cruel trapping!!

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Andrea Sreiber

---

**Jake Peterson**

**Canton SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Jay Lems**

**Canton SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Andrea Hinrichs**

**Beresford SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

My full income comes from the trapping industry (I work at Dakotaline Snares in Lennox). I am opposed to the trap check proposals. I am also very alarmed at what seems to be an antitrapping crusade being fostered by at least one commissioner.

---

**Hunter Kjose**

**Lennox SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I am against the proposal to change trap check times. It seems like South Dakota is becoming more and more anti trapping with some of these regulations. These changes are not needed.

---

**Larry Ymker**

**Akron IA**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

My comments are that trappers do not need more controls and rules. This is another attempt to take over the trapping industry in South Dakota. I live East River where we already check traps every other day. More rules more chances for people to mess with our equipment. This rule would cause considerable problems for trappers. People would run a shorter line less predators would be killed more birds would be killed (pheasant and turkeys) more livestock depredation. More rules but less protection for people. People are in more danger from predators. I have a SD Drivers Licence with Iowa address down here in SE corner of the State of South Dakota.

---

**Robert Ambos**

**Bartlett IL**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.



---

**Kenneth Lindskov**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

In a State where the Governor supports predator control in support of pheasant nesting, I can not believe the Commission could support a 24-hour check law that would severely limit trapping and predator control.

---

**Carter Fillaus**

**Avon SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I urge you to vote no on this petition. I am a youth trapper and feel that current regulation are just fine. Thanks for consider my comments

---

**Sandy Steck**

**Canton SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I have spent much time trapping with my husband. No one cares about the welfare of the animals more than him. The bunny huggers and city dwellers have no clue!

---

**Gage Bares**

**Avon SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I strongly urge you to vote no on this petition.between going g to school and working this new Law would greatly hinder my ability to trap.

---

**Darci Adams**

**Hartford SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

August 28, 2019

Chair Gary Jensen  
South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks Commission  
South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks  
523 East Capitol Ave  
Pierre, SD 57501

Re: Support the proposal modifying rule 41:08:02:03 to require 24-hour trap checks

Dear Chair Jensen and members of the commission,

The Humane Society of the United States opposes the trapping and killing of animals for fur pelts and trophies because it causes needless and unjustifiable death and is, therefore, inconsistent with the aims of a humane society. With this in mind, on behalf of our South Dakota members and supporters we urge you to support the proposal modifying rule 41:08:02:03 to require trappers to check their traps once every 24 hours. This proposal offers a commonsense update to South Dakota's trapping rules. This change is necessary to reduce animal suffering, to protect unintended victims, and to provide accountability to citizens who have a public interest in healthy wild animal populations and a personal concern for the safety of their companion animals.

#### Animals suffer because of lax trap check times

Target and non-target animals frequently sustain severe injuries from being trapped, ranging from claw loss and deep flesh cuts to broken bones and tooth fractures, among many others. The type and severity of injury varies with factors such as the type of trap, the species trapped, weather conditions, and duration of time in the trap. Requiring trap checks once every 24 hours will reduce animal suffering by limiting physical injuries to animals. Trapped animals also likely suffer from thirst, hunger, anxiety, fear, pain, and distress. Requiring trap checks every 24 hours has the potential to reduce some of this suffering as well.

#### Lax trap check times put unintended victims at risk

Traps are indiscriminate, often capturing "non-target" animals. Other wildlife, including threatened and endangered species, and pet dogs and cats are at risk of needless and unjustifiable suffering and death because of infrequent trap checks. These animals have a better chance of surviving with frequent trap checks.

#### Wildlife professionals support frequent trap check times

Requiring traps to be checked at least once every 24 hours is a reasonable proposal. The Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA) instructs new trappers in its trapper education manual that they must check traps daily. The American Society of Mammologists, in its guide for using wild animals in research, states that some trap types should be checked twice daily or even more frequently, and that most traps should be checked at least once a day to minimize mortality or injury to animals. Most states require trap checks to occur daily or once every 24 hours in some trapping situations or for some trap types.

To the specific proposed changes, we suggest that 4 and 5 be modified to ensure that release is prioritized over euthanasia for animals that can be released. Euthanasia of trapped animals should be only a last resort. We also encourage you to require that animals that are injured in the course of a violation of this trap check requirement be transported to a licensed wildlife rehabilitation facility or veterinarian for treatment or for humane euthanasia if the best efforts to rehabilitate and release the animal fail.

For the foregoing reasons we request your support for the proposal modifying rule 41:08:02:03 to require trappers to check their traps once every 24 hours.

Sincerely,

Darci Adams  
Senior State Director, The Dakotas  
The Humane Society of the United States  
PO Box 733  
Hartford, SD 57033

---

**Lisa Moore**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

You can't argue with common sense - every 24 hours is very reasonable.

---

**Kandy Hastings**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

To stop needless suffering and cruelty to all animals I support the gfp.sd proposal of trap checking every 24 hrs.

---

**Kasie Heiden**

**Vermillion SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

As someone who lives in a rural location, I believe traps should be checked daily (at least every 24 hours) primarily to prevent pets from being caught for multiple days. It is not uncommon for people who live in the country to let their farm dogs and cats roam. When these pets are gone for longer than normal people begin to fear the worst - did they get swept away by the river, fall into something they can't get out, get hit by a vehicle and yes, are they stuck in a trap? Some of these we can't prevent but this is one that we can. Additionally, I would recommend that the fine incurred from not checking traps be rather significant. We shouldn't have to wait for a child to go missing for days and be stuck before we make this a requirement.

---

**Philip Neuharth**

**Menno SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Cody Soukup**

**Avon SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I am 14 years old and enjoy trapping very much. I urge you to vote no on this petition.

---

**Anne Fuehrer**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

Requiring traps to be checked at least once every 24 hours will reduce animal suffering and protect unintended victims.

---

**Mary Potter**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

To start with, I am opposed to trapping. It is a cruel and inhumane practice. At the least, the traps should be checked daily! An animal trapped is suffering in so many ways, and a trapped female leaves her young ones in jeopardy without her protection. Please, support anything that curtails this practice. Thank you.

---

**Julie Anderson**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I support moving the trap check time to at least once every 24 hours. If trappers cannot minimize the time an animal has to endure the cruelty of a trap, it should be abolished. This is the bare minimum of comfort an animal who is facing death can be provided, and it is the duty of the GF&P to enforce this regulation. Extreme weather, loss of limb, mutilations and extreme pain are part of trapping and to not minimize the time an animal is subjected to these conditions is unacceptable.

---

**Patricia Stock**

**Olmsted Falls OH**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

24 hour trap checks would cut down on more non select animals getting help. Cats, dogs, and other animals aren't targeted but are caught in these traps. If you want to trap than you should check your traps every 24 hours.

---

**Jessica Goldammer**

**Mitchell SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I support checking traps every 24 hours instead of 2-3 days.

---

**Tracie Allen**

**Bismarck SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I strongly support the checking of traps in a 24-hour period. The 2 and 3 day period is in-humain. These animals feel fear and pain, they also need to have water and food to sustain them like we do. Please, please have compassion, pass this bill for the 24-hour check. PLEASE!

---

**Cody Soukup**

**Avon SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I am 14 years old and enjoy trapping very much. I urge you to vote no on this petition.

---

**Rachel Welch**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Traps should be checked daily to reduce the amount of suffering not only in the animals intended to trap, but also those who are unintentionally trapped including stray or loose household pets.

---

**Lucille Howey**

**Hill City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

All responsible trappers should be willing to check their traps within 24 hours of putting them out.

---

**William Kurtenbach**

**Groton SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I have read the proposed changes to trapping regulations. I cannot believe the commission even accepted the proposal because the changes are so indescribably ridiculous, totally unenforceable, and most importantly, totally unwarranted. I have trapped for many years in SD and other states and I cannot believe the commission is considering something this bizarre in my home state of South Dakota. No changes are needed to the trapping regulations in South Dakota.

---

**Mark Wetmore**

**Vermillion SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I OPPOSE ANY TRAPPING ON PRINCIPAL; AND WITH THE TAIL BOUNTY THE STATE HAS GONE COMPLETELY TO THE DARK SIDE.  
BUT, LACKING PROHIBITION, I SUPPORT 24 HOUR CHECKS.